REPORT RESUMES

ED 015 151 SP 001 371

THE ATLANTA AREA WORKSHOP ON PREPARING TEACHERS TO WORK WITH DISADVANTAGED YOUTH (PINE MOUNTAIN, GEORGIA, MARCH 5-8, 1967).

BY- CODY, WILMER S. SHUFELT, LYNN, F.
URBAN LABORATORY IN EDUCATION, ATLANTA, GA.
ATLANTA AREA TEACHER EDUC. SERVICE, GA.
SOUTHERN ASSN. OF COLL. AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

PUB DATE 8 MAR 67
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$5.64 139P.

DESCRIPTORS- CULTURAL AWARENESS, CULTURAL DISADVANTAGEMENT, *DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, INDIVIDUAL INSTRUCTION, INSERVICE EDUCATION, INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS, NEGRO STUDENTS, PROGRAM PLANNING, TEACHER ATTITUDES, *TEACHER EDUCATION, TEACHER PROGRAMS, *TEACHER WORKSHOPS, ATLANTA

THIS IS A REPORT OF A WORKSHOP FOR 114 SOUTHERN EDUCATIONAL LEADERS WHICH AIMED AT (1) INVESTIGATING THE PROBLEMS FACED BY TEACHERS OF DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN, (2) GENERATING IDEAS FOR MODEL PRE-SERVICE AND IN-SERVICE PROGRAMS FOR SUCH TEACHERS, AND (3) HAVING WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS DESIGN SUCH PROGRAMS. THERE WAS GENERAL AGREEMENT THAT THE BASIC PROBLEM WAS THE INABILITY OF MIDDLE CLASS TEACHERS TO UNDERSTAND THE CULTURE, NEEDS, AND ASPIRATIONS OF LOWER CLASS CHILDREN, TOGETHER WITH INADEQUATE TRAINING TO ENABLE THE TEACHER TO FASHION A PROGRAM OR MATERIALS TO MEET THESE NEEDS. SUGGESTED TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS EMPHASIZED COURSES IN URBAN SOCIOLOGY, FIELD EXPERIENCE IN DEPRIVED AREAS, AND TRAINING IN INDIVIDUALIZING INSTRUCTION AND PRODUCING LEARNING MATERIALS SPECIFICALLY GEARED TO THE DISADVANTAGED CHILD. SPECIAL STRESS WAS PLACED ON IMPROVING TEACHER ATTITUDES TOWARD AND UNDERSTANDING OF DEPRIVED YOUTH. PROCEEDINGS OF WORKSHOP HELD MAR. 5-8, 1967 AT CALLAWAY GARDENS, PINE MOUNTAIN, GEORGIA. (AW)

SP001371

C800

ED015151

The
Atlanta Area Workshop

ON
PREPARING TEACHERS TO WORK WITH DISADVANTAGED YOUTH

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

MARCH 5-8, 1967

PINE MOUNTAIN, GA.

The

Atlanta Area Workshop

ON

PREPARING TEACHERS TO WORK WITH DISADVANTAGED YOUTH

Sponsored By

The Atlanta Area Teacher Education Service
The Education Improvement Project of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
The Southeastern Education Laboratory
The Urban Laboratory in Education

In Cooperation With

The National Institute for Advanced Study in Teaching Disadvantaged Youth—An AACTE Project with NDEA Funds

MARCH 5-8, 1967

Callaway Gardens
Pine Mountain, Georgia

WORKSHOP CO-DIRECTORS:

Mr. Wilmer S. Cody
Mr. Lynn F. Shufelt

The

Atlanta Area Workshop

ON

PREPARING TEACHERS TO WORK WITH DISADVANTAGED YOUTH

Sponsored By

The Atlanta Area Teacher Education Service

The Education Improvement Project of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools

The Southeastern Education Laboratory

The Urban Laboratory in Education

In Cooperation With

The National Institute for Advanced Study in Teaching Disadvantaged Youth—An AACTE Project with NDEA Funds

MARCH 5-8, 1967
Callaway Gardens
Pine Mountain, Georgia

WORKSHOP CO-DIRECTORS:
Mr. Wilmer S. Cody
Mr. Lynn F. Shufelt

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Introduction 1

Dr. Herbert Schueler 4

Teacher Panel

  Miss Gail Burbridge 17
  Miss Rosa Chapman 24
  Miss Sharon Williams 28
  Dr. David E. Day 33

Dr. Doxey Wilkerson 42

Dr. Hobart Burns 61

Dr. Dorothy McGeoch 78

Summary of Group Discussion Reports 98

Group Discussion Reports 103

Workshop Summary 119

Evaluation 122

Participants 127

INTRODUCTION

One hundred fourteen educational leaders from school systems, colleges, universities and other educational associations from the Atlanta Metropolitan Area and from throughout the South attended the Atlanta Area Workshop on Preparing Teachers to Work with Disadvantaged Youth. The workshop was held in the convention headquarters of the Callaway Gardens Holiday Inn Motel, Pine Mountain, Georgia--a vacation area about one hundred miles southwest of Atlanta. The workshop began with registration on Sunday afternoon, March 5, and ended with the noon meal, Wednesday, March 8.

The purpose of the workshop was to generate ideas for pre-service and in-service teacher education programs that attend to the special problems of working with disadvantaged youth. The workshop was not intended to create, by itself, changes in the participating institutions; the process of revising or creating new educational programs in colleges and school systems is too complex for a three-day workshop. Nor did the participants come to the workshop with an institutional commitment to adopt new programs. The workshop was planned to create such a commitment within the individual participant by putting him through a series of carefully designed experiences. The "set" that the participants brought to the workshop varied from ignorance of the need for special teacher education programs to firm commitment to specific new programs. The purpose of the workshop was to move as many participants as possible to the latter position.

The aims of the workshop were as follows: convince the participants that teachers who work with disadvantaged children have special problems; generate ideas or descriptions of "model" pre-service and in-service programs for teachers; establish program plans by having the participants go through the process of designing teacher education programs. The four workshop sponsors are to provide assistance in creating new or revised teacher education programs in (or between) the school systems, colleges and universities.

The workshop structure had two main features that were designed to accomplish the aims enumerated above. The first were addresses at the general sessions made by four speakers and a panel of teachers. These addresses demonstrated the need for teacher education and described the nature of program alternatives. The other feature of the workshop, the small group session, was the vehicle intended to accomplish the commitment of each participant to some program. These were not just discussion groups; they were program planning groups. The ten group chairmen had an outline of a sequence of tasks to follow and each group produced, by the last session, several descriptions of teacher education programs.

The task force representing school systems, colleges, and other organizations in the Atlanta area was created following the workshop. Its main purpose is to encourage the creation of new teacher education programs and to serve as a communication vehicle and forum for problems of common concern.

The workshop was sponsored by four organizations: The Urban

Laboratory in Education, the Atlanta Area Teacher Education Service, The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, and the South Georgia Component of the Southern Education Laboratory. Wilmer Cody, Director of Teacher Education for the Urban Laboratory, and Lynn F. Shufelt, Coordinator of the Atlanta Area Teacher Education Service, were co-directors of the workshop. Dr. John Codwell of Southern Association (SACS) and Dr. James Hinson of the Regional Laboratory (SEL) represented their organizations by contributing much time to both the planning and implementation of the workshop.

The workshop was made possible by a grant from the National NDEA Institute for Advanced Study in Teaching Disadvantaged Youth, a project of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education.

54
27
27

"Teacher Education for the Disadvantaged: An Over-view"

an address by

Dr. Herbert Schueler, President
Richmond College, New York, New York

This has been characterized by your chairman as a keynote address. I accepted in full knowledge of the conventions that require such an address, if only to provide an occasion for all the participants to assemble in the same room at the outset to get acquainted with one another, and to provide a kind of overture to the opera--recognizing all along that the important things will come later. Nobody in his right mind would consider the appetizer more important than the main course or even the dessert. There are preliminary bouts greater than the main event. I know my role, ladies and gentlemen, and I've been known to give a rousing prelude on other similar occasions. But my task this time, quite frankly, has been made much more difficult by the audience I'm facing.

On the plane coming down from the icy North to the balmy South this morning, I looked over the roster of participants in this workshop. You, without question, represent the leadership role in teacher education in this area. The purpose of your deliberations in "providing innovative programs for the preparation of teachers to work with disadvantaged youth" will be the significant outcome of this workshop, and not any words of mine.

My task is to provide the kickoff. Someone, after all, has to.

In the process I shall, like the coach of a possibly already inspired team, provide some measure, even if un-needed, of stimulation, spur, and inspiration. If in the process I shall say some things which are unpleasant and unsettling, I trust that you of all people will realize that we are talking in this conference of matters which have their roots amid deprivation and misery. No one as yet has found the way, thank God, to find complacency in poverty; advantage in disadvantage; or nobility in the exigencies of slum living. Our task, therefore, is to help find ways for teachers to combat with disadvantages that a combination of historic forces in our society is forcing on ever increasing numbers of our population. These are disadvantages that threaten as never before the very essence of our democratic traditions, that hold that every individual, regardless of background, can achieve that status in society that his native talents and his own will entitle him to. It would be vain for me to contend that barriers to this tradition of free development of the individual have not always existed in our society. They have, and in great measure. Race, national origin, religion, economic status, sex, even politics, have served in various ways to inhibit the free aspirations of individuals. Yet in an age which is making the greatest philosophical and moral progress in overcoming these barriers, economic and social forces are determining just the opposite. There is just not much of a productive place left in our society for the unskilled. Automation is increasingly invading the functions of the manual worker, the functions that have traditionally provided the lower socio-economic levels of our society with the wherewithal, however mean, of basic existence. The world of work, of muscular brawn and physical dexterity, so extolled by the romantics, is proving to be progressively surplus and antiquated in a rapidly automated society. The lifting of the bale is now done by a crane; the harvest is achieved by the combine; and even the work of the domestic is being done more cheaply and efficiently by the washer-dryer and the automatic dishwasher. Even machines are run by computers, not men. And the unskilled are rapidly becoming surplus human commodities. The white collar is gradually displacing the blue.

Coupled with this rapid automation is the equally rapid urbanization of our society. This urbanization represents the increasing centralization of population around centers of industry and commerce. After all, that's where the action is, and where sometimes there is an opportunity for security for the lower socio-economic levels of population. But all too often the mistaken lure of finding a better life represents a last hope gone wrong. There are being created, as a consequence, in all the centers of population of our land, inner-cities of deprivation that rival the ghettos of medieval Europe in providing encapsulated centers of social misery from which there is no escape--except that provided by self-pity and withdrawal, sometimes buttressed by the solace of narcotics and alcohol; or the outward revolt in crime; or, as happened in the Old World, in Asia, and Africa, and may indeed happen in the New, the desperation step of violent revolution.

It is one of the supreme ironies of modern times that the cities have changed their role from providing the opportunities for upward mobility for the lower-class immigrant from foreign shores to providing a final depressed social nadir for the American in-migrant. The spreading American ghetto of the sixties tends to depress the social mobility of its inhabitants, and doom them--as did the ghettos of the Old World of another century and as do the "barrios" infesting Latin American cities today--to live and die in a permanently depressed social, economic, and human condition. We're in danger, in this enlightened decade, of achieving what our democratic society, to its eternal and unique credit, has always avoided. And that is a cementing of social classes from which the lowest can never escape. I cannot emphasize too strongly that this is the paramount problem of our time; a problem that unless corrected in sufficient measure will destroy all we have held virtuous and dear, as completely and as fatally as any nuclear holocaust.

A while ago I stated that this conference has a mission to help find ways for teachers to combat the deprivations of the disadvantaged in our society. Why single out teachers? Why not industrialists, government officials, social workers, ministers, businessmen? Why put the burden on teachers? After all, they've struggles of their own to maintain their proper place in society. Their lot has been more to be blamed than praised. Obviously, teachers cannot do it alone. But I submit that this task of combatting disadvantage cannot be achieved without the school and a corps of teachers trained and dedicated as never before and for this purpose. In an almost ignored message to the nation, President Johnson referred to the very unique--in modern United States history--role of the schools in building a democratic society. He said, in closing his message to Congress in January, 1965--in which he proposed an unprecedented expenditure of federal funds for education primarily intended for the disadvantaged (by the way, this conference is an ultimate beneficiary of that message)--"Once again we must start where men who would improve their society have always known they must begin; with an educational system restudied, reinforced, revitalized."

If an educational system is to be restudied, is to be reinforced, and is to be revitalized, then it is the one major, pervading force in any educational system that must be restudied, reinforced, revitalized. And that force is the teachers, who provide the everyday leadership and human contact with students, and without whom no possibility of achieving effective human development through the medium of the school can be realized. Therefore, our focus in this conference is upon the teacher, his preparation and continuing education; and by extension of course the program of the school.

It is sometimes difficult for the layman, and tragically enough even for some teachers, to realize the potential personal and institutional power that the schools represent. Just consider for a moment the physical and temporal scope of the school. It is the one publicly endowed social agency that is within relatively easy access of every man, woman, and child in the community. It occupies a dominant portion of the daily life of every child and adolescent from at least the age of six to the age of sixteen. His represents a time span that can rival, if properly handled, the influence of all the other hours of the day, all the other weeks, and all the other years. To cap these advantages it is permanently endowed with public funds, and is clearly (however meagerly supported) the one permanent, stable public institution in every community. I submit that there is no extra-familial force as potentially powerful in any community as is the school and its corps of teachers. If it is the community that is disadvantaged, it is the school and its teachers that have the primary potential to build in its clientele, both child and adult, the power to achieve strength and status sufficient to rise above their depressed condition. It is true that the school cannot do it alone; but little will happen of any significant **amount** without the school.

The foregoing are all preachments. They are not difficult to understand; they are perhaps rather easy to agree to. However, it is one thing to recognize the problem and its correction and quite another matter to solve it. Let me therefore attempt some propositions, many of them controversial, which may help establish directions of programs and practices for teacher education with a mission to help disadvantaged youth--propositions which I believe to be of basic moment.

First, let me pose the proposition that the nature of the deprivation of our disadvantaged population requires unique treatment specifically geared to their present status and to their educational, social, and economic needs as they now exist. By extension this holds true for the work of the teacher and for the training that he needs. This view, by the way, has been widely challenged. The argument goes something like this: what is so different about the role of the teacher in working with disadvantaged youth and the role of the teacher anywhere? Aren't the requirements of good teaching sufficiently basic and universally applicable to build programs of teacher education that will equip teachers to function effectively, wherever they may be appointed, slum or suburb, with youngsters of deprivation or privilege? (By the way, this view is most frequently held by professors of education and least frequently by classroom teachers.) The answer, at least to me, is simple. The generalizations may apply to all; but the applications are unique--specific to each child, each group, each community. Teacher education stands or falls by the effect it has on the teacher's work with a particular child, in a particular group, in a particular neighborhood. Life for all of us would be much simpler if an ideal, universally applicable mode of teaching and teacher education were possible, steeped in unchanging principles and practices that would "fit" and apply to every condition.

The tragic failure of the inner-city schools in this decade should be sufficient evidence to refute this fond dream. (By the way, if this dream were a reality, there would be no need for this conference!) There is evidence, for example, that in some inner-city areas the longer the disadvantaged child remains in school, the farther behind does he fall in relationship to the norms of scholastic achievement applicable to his age group. A recent study in a particular city showed that incidents of delinquency were greater among youth before they dropped out of school than after. In the face of this kind of experience, there is exquisite irony in the national "Stay in school; Don't drop out" movement. The "child" can be understood as theory. But the teacher works with Henry, Jose, and even with Bartholomew. And his education, both pre- and in-service must vitally and ultimately equip him to deal with them as specific human beings. "Mankind" is a useful and unifying concept for philosophers and poets; but "men" in all their unique individuality are the reality.

When one begins to pursue this enquiry into elements that are unique to teacher education for the disadvantaged, one quickly finds that their number is legion, and that many of the elements are of basic significance and must be taken into direct account in any viable program of pre-service or in-service teacher education. Let me analyze but a few examples.

The school is, by its very nature, a conservative institution. It is primarily focused on perpetuating the mores and ideals of the community it serves. In a very real sense it is most comfortable in its role of helping the individual to adjust, to accept, and to further the values and conventions of the community to which he was born. But what value is there in deprivation? What virtue in poverty? What are the ideals worth emulating and transmitting that arise out of a state of social, economic, and human disadvantage? In a very real sense, the goal of education for the disadvantaged is not adjustment, but alienation; not contentment, but discontent with life style that envelopes them; not apathetic acceptance of their lot, but the will and power to revolt. The disadvantaged must be helped to fashion a community for which they have few models in their own life. I submit that this imperative alone requires unique approaches and presents unique problems, the solving of which preciously few of us have had any experience in. Yet no imperative is as crucial in its implications for teaching and teacher education for the disadvantaged.

Consider in addition the perquisites of the teacher's role in a school serving a disadvantaged community. In an earlier, less complicated time textbooks on teacher education were want to extol the virtues of teacher participation in the community. "Only to the degree," one such book reads, "that the parents get to know you and like you can you fulfill your end of the partnership between family and teacher guiding proper child development. Live in the community, therefore; participate in its social and civic affairs. Join the bridge club, the bowling group; help in Community Chest drives." All well and good. But does this apply here? The teacher, no matter what his socio-economic origin, is of a higher social class than the disadvantaged families of his student. Where his students live, and under the conditions in which they live, he will not live; nor should he be expected to. His are the familiar middle class virtues and aspirations; his life style is not their life style. In a significant number of characteristics that matter most in establishing the necessary empathic relationship with his student, he is a stranger to them. Yet this stranger is the teacher who is expected to act effectively, in loco parentis for youth who usually lack, and need so desperately, the stabilizing influence of a viable family life. This stranger is expected to know intimately the everyday life style that is fashioning his students personality and behavior. Unless the teacher knows, how can he be expected to help the student develop the power, the fortitude, and the strength of character to rise above this condition?

A universal axiom of good teaching is "Begin where the student is, not where you fondly hope he should be." But where is he? He's in the streets, in overcrowded hovels, in a non-supportive environment hostile to his proper development. Here knowledge is not enough. The teacher's attitude--toward the pupil whose life style and environment cannot fail to be basically abhorrent to him--is probably even more important. There is room here for thorough-going soul searching, recognizing prejudices and so fashioning actions toward, and relationships with, these children that the result is supportive, not alienative; firm, but not punitive; respecting, but not rejecting. It is tragically true, by the way, that many schools serving disadvantaged youngsters prepare them best for life in a penal institution and least for participation in a democratic community.

The function of the school and the teacher is largely one of complementing the educative forces of family and community. But we know through overwhelming evidence that these educative and socializing forces are far weaker in the disadvantaged society. In many cases, they are effectively antagonistic and at cross-purposes to the aspirations of the school. Martin Deutsch has said, "When the home is a proportionately less effective socializing force, the school must become a more effective one." Herein lies, therefore, another dimension of the uniqueness in the educational imperatives that should guide teacher education practices.

I trust that these few examples make the point. But I should like to dwell on one implication for teacher education programs that I believe to be crucial, and that was implied in the examples cited above. No program of teacher education, to be effective--particularly for service to the disadvantaged--can be organized apart from the clientele and the neighborhood it is expected to serve. Callaway Gardens is not a suitable center to train teachers to work effectively in the slums of Atlanta, however appropriate it may be as a training ground to equip service personnel with the principles and practices of the care and feeding of members of the Workshop on Preparing Teachers to Work with Disadvantaged Youth. If the object of a program is to develop in teachers the skills to work with disadvantaged children in a decaying neighborhood, a goodly portion of its program must be directed toward that neighborhood. And a good portion of the guided teacher education experiences of the students should be in that neighborhood with the children that the teacher is expected to serve later on.

This will require the professionals to descent, hopefully forever (or is it too much to hope?), from their ivory towers to the specific environment in which their charges are expected to serve. It will require them, in other words, to go back to school; but not to the school they fondly remember from their own experiences. The school they believe should exist doesn't; and possibly never will.

As a corollary to this imperative for a realistic, on-the-spot guided experience, is the need for a prolongation of a teacher's preparation to include far more supervisory supportive help in the first years of service. Indeed a continuing process of continuing guided teacher development is absolutely needed, particularly for the teachers of the disadvantaged. Dewey once said that the only certainty in life is that things will change. Change requires continuing adaptation. As society changes, so do the requirements of teaching change--a truism that I hope has been made abundantly clear in my remarks.

I have come close to the end, I know you'll be glad to hear. However, no teacher worth his salt leaves off without providing the opportunity for a summary. Of course good teaching practice requires that summaries come from the group and not the teacher. However, no one in his right mind would even consider talking for as long as I have without audience interruption, as good teaching practice. I will therefore violate my principles further and conclude with the following short statement!

In everything I have said there is an underlying motif. Simply stated, it is that the school's function in serving a disadvantaged community is fundamentally to help fashion, primarily through its working with you, a new and better social order. George Counts once wrote a highly controversial book for an age somewhat earlier than the present. It was entitled Dare the School Build A New Social Order? This I will say for our age: "'Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order?' For the disadvantaged, at least, they had better!"

It cannot be done without the school's help. Otherwise, the kind of social order we all want--one based on reason and love rather than on privilege and power--will forever remain an illusion, an unattainable dream.

Teacher Panel:
"Working With Disadvantaged Children: The Teacher's Viewpoint"

an address by
Gail Burbridge; teacher, Atlanta Public Schools
Communication Skills Laboratories

Two years ago I began my teaching assignment at West Fulton with roughly equal portions of enthusiasm and ignorance. Students came without homework, and I scolded. I thought students should do homework. I soon found out that some had no place to do their homework; some were working until after my bedtime and had no opportunity to do their work at home. My scolding was not doing any good at all. I had to learn that useful homework must be provided in the classroom for these students that couldn't work at home.

When children came late I was offended. When children came to my classroom and slept, I was offended. I woke up the sleepers. Children squimed and moved all during class. It bothered me. I made them stay still. As a result I woke up the sleepers and put to sleep the squirmers.

The first time the students used vulgar language I was caught completely off guard. Some of them I sent to Mr. Thornton. Now I think I might have dealt with them better if I had known some of the things I now know about these children and their language patterns. Now I decide first whether the outburst is disturbing the possibility for learning in the classroom. But at first I was just concerned with those things I thought were inappropriate--"bad for young children." I thought I could protect some children from the same children they walked home with and played with after school.

I was disturbed by poor attendance. When a child came back after an absence I spoke shortly with him about the need for coming to school, the need for an education, the need for preparing himself to get ahead in this world. It never occurred to me to welcome him back, to concentrate especially on giving him work in the classroom that would make him feel that his time spent there was more valuable than that spent in whatever way he was spending it outside the classroom. I now teach children that I see only occasionally. I make it a point to welcome them when they come back, rather than making it more unpleasant for them to be there.

In short, I didn't know at the beginning how to distinguish between behavior that seemed annoying or inappropriate and behavior that actually interfered with learning. As a corollary to this, I didn't feel able to evaluate my own success in teaching children several years behind grade level in language skills. I knew where I had found them; but I didn't know where I might reasonably be expected to take them in one year.

What I learned in my first year I learned from my principal and other experienced teachers on the staff at West Fulton. Unfortunately too much of this kind of learning comes after the fact, after the relationship with a child may have been lost. It seems to me that this is not a very economical way for a teacher to learn her art. So I would like to propose several improvements:

First, that the schools of education attempt to identify early among their students those with an interest in, and the temperament for, teaching in deprived areas. Second, that they provide these students with more and more practical training in psychology and sociology. Third, that they should offer well-supervised internships in the classrooms of deprived neighborhoods. And fourth, that the early in-service program should stress supervisors to support, evaluate, and criticize the intern's work in the classroom. I see things to be done in both the school of education and in early pre-service training.

I think you already know what I mean by identifying those students who demonstrate some of the personal and temperamental qualities necessary for teaching in deprived areas. But I would like to talk a little bit more about some of the things that need to be taught in the school of education. I said that I thought it was important to provide more and more practical training in the psychology of the learner and the sociological make-up of the community--through live contact with the children and the families of the children to be taught. I never saw, before I entered the classroom, the children that I was going to teach. I remember looking out of the window in the Teachers' Lounge on the second floor the first day of school and seeing thousands of kids going into that building. I looked at those children and realized at that moment that I knew nothing whatever of the families they came from, the lives they lived, the things they did on the way to and on the way home from school, or what they had been through in school in the seven years before I met them.

I think teacher-trainees should have the experience of making their own case studies; they should have the information necessary to recognize serious personality disturbances in the classroom. I have come across, in my few years of teaching, children who have problems serious enough to be referred and treated outside of the classroom. I think a teacher should know the difference between what she can handle and what she cannot handle, between what is typical in the culture and what is deviant regardless of culture.

Students need more direct, personal experience with the culture--its patterns of family structure, home life, occupational and educational level, and the effects of financial and traditional poverty where they occur. They need to be personally familiar with what Dr. Schueler calls the "life style" of the community from which their children will come. Although this country embraces several vastly different types of disadvantaged cultures, a trainee must learn how to learn a culture--its patterns and its unique value system. If one of us is trained to teach in a certain kind of deprived area in Atlanta, and ends up in New York City or Miami, at least we have learned one culture and have learned methods and approaches to culture study. It seems to me that to know a culture is to know what should and what shouldn't be done; what can be done and what can't be done; what simply disconcerts a well-brought-up teacher and what interferes with the positive growth and development of the child.

I thought that I had learned a lot my first year, but I let one student get by not more than a couple of months ago. He was a child who appeared in the classroom ten minutes late every day, and also slept in class. I allowed him to sleep for about half the class period and then I awakened him. I had found that a short rest at the beginning made him more attentive for the rest of the period. This child was very active, very agreeable, and became a leader of sorts in the class. However, he did arrive about ten minutes late every day. I think that this concerned the rest of the class. They needed to know that something was going to be done about the boy's tardiness, that the school was going to be orderly.

So we solved our disciplinary problem. Then one day I realized that the boy had passed out in class. With some help I got him to the nurse, only to find that he didn't have the cold that I'd been talking to his mother on the phone about. He wasn't really so tired from working in his after-school job that his mother had taken him out of. The difficulty was with the bottles that were found stashed away in the men's restroom. That's what he'd been doing for those ten minutes before he arrived in my classroom.

Now I think that I should have been prepared to have considered all the possibilities in this student's case. It may be that no one could have recognized it. His other teachers didn't. But the problem had gotten quite serious by the time it was discovered. He actually had to pass out before anybody knew that something was wrong.

My second point with regard to training was that student internship should, and must, be in the deprived area school. The intern should have the experience of teaching, testing, and identifying specific children's problems in that area. She should not, as so often happens, replace the supervising teacher for the duration of her practice teaching quarter; rather, she should work closely and continually with that teacher.

There should be an opportunity for the intern to examine and evaluate in the classroom the adjusted materials specifically designed for the educationally disadvantaged. There should be an opportunity for her to try out methods of teaching the language skills of whatever subject area she has chosen. She should come to the classroom only after she understands the need for language development in all areas. But she must work with the flesh and blood deprived class to learn how to identify and meet specific language deficiencies. In summary, it seems to me that a major concern of schools of education should be to nourish the kinds of skills and understandings appropriate to the deprived classroom.

As a post script, I should like to add that no teacher should be sent out to help children with a poor general education until she herself has a good, solid general education. The educational deficiencies of the deprived child are so far-reaching and generalized that even the secondary teacher must be prepared to treat intelligently any matter that impinges on the understanding of the matter at hand. To teach English well she must also be prepared to teach science, civics, geography, money and banking, and anything else that somes between the child and his competent use and appreciation of the language.

When the teacher finally enters the profession, she must have some means of comparison with the reasonable expectations of master teachers in her own situation. She needs a supervisor working closely with her as she plans her lessons, and equally closely as she criticizes her effectiveness in the classroom. (Here is where instructional teams might be quite effective.)

No teacher should come to a deprived school not knowing what to expect, not knowing what is expected of her. Proper pre-service and early in-service training can and must minimize the waste and the loss of good teaching.

Teacher Panel:
"Working With Disadvantaged Children: The Teacher's Viewpoint"

an address by

Rosa Chapman; Staff Teacher
Title III., Atlanta Public Schools

I would like to express my viewpoint on working with disadvantaged youth. I believe first that it is the responsibility of the school to go into the community and plan for the particular needs of that community --to seek out its problems and define its goals. The classroom teacher within the school can realize then the needs of the families in the community and adopt his or her methods to that of the family and child. In order for a teacher to establish good rapport within a family, she has to become a part of the community; she, or he, has to become almost "deprived" in an effort to understand each child's problem. With these attitudes in mind we can hope that the teacher can relate to the child in the classroom as an individual, and not to them as a group. Each child is different and does not act or respond to the same problem in the same manner.

As a teacher I have found that a child from a deprived home may not have both parents at home; the mother is home sometimes. The father is absent most of the time, often always. This situation is many times disastrous to the male child. The male child more so than the female child needs a definite figure by which to mold himself; the female child is secure, because her mother is home and her teacher at school is usually a female. Therefore one significant thing for the school to do is to place more male teachers in the early grades of schools for disadvantaged children. This may be done on a team basis with male and female teachers working together in the school, serving a dual purpose.

More direct association with the child during the pre-service or student teaching program can acquaint a prospective teacher with the good and the unfortunate aspects of teaching disadvantaged children--helping a teacher realize that her job will be more than an 8:30 to 3:00 "baby-sitting" duty. More student aide programs are worth investigating and initiating for those who may decide early in their career training to prepare for teaching. I do feel that the allotted time of six weeks or nine weeks is not sufficient for determining whether one will become a good teacher. The student teaching period is usually scheduled too late in a college program for one to think seriously of alternatives, if failure or disillusionment occurs. Often teaching may even be forced upon a disillusioned student teacher who will have to accept the teaching profession in order to complete his college program and graduate within the four or five year allotted time for college work.

A teacher's training program should never end, whether he is a first-year teacher or a fifth-year teacher. A teacher has to continue training throughout his teaching career. More child study or human behavior programs should be initiated for the growing teaching professional; these programs should be required of all teachers. Such courses would aid the teacher in understanding the problems of the community in which she works. Dr. Schueler stated last evening that "the school is an institution which should reflect the goals of education." If this is true, then the child should reflect the uniqueness and importance of the classroom teacher.

Recently I was involved in a situation with a child from a deprived home who enjoyed getting attention any way that he possibly could--even at the expense of others. On several occasions I was asked to release this child from his class studies so that he could clean the school grounds, as punishment. I resented this very much because the child was just beginning to show great interest in his class studies, and his attendance had improved greatly. Now all of you here tell me: What is a teacher to do in a situation like this? Is she to reflect the goals of her administrators, or the goals of education?

It seems to me that any planning group, after reaching a decision on how to carry out a program for deprived children, must be certain that each school administrator involved understands the goals of this particular program and agrees to abide by it. (By the way, the boy that I mentioned is now in a juvenile home. I wonder--if he had been given the chance to continue his interest in the classroom, would he have gone into that juvenile home? Maybe he still would have. But I believe the time for such action would have been delayed.)

A teacher must plan the child's program so that he can experience acceptance, security, love, and freedom for creativity and accomplishment. A teacher must not assume anything! Patience and guidance should be paramount with all teachers, not only those teaching deprived children. A teacher's method of teaching must be constantly reviewed and evaluated in order to recognize the problems and meet the needs of all the children. As a child grows, so must a teacher's method grow. In-service continuing programs of learning for the teacher are always needed.

In planning a program for the deprived--whether culturally, economically, or socially deprived--we must assume that the home and school are two different systems. They are different in structure, expectations, and requirements. They are different in the behavior that they demand of children and the rewards they offer. Yet we find that the child can function in these two systems successfully, if two conditions are fulfilled. First, the child must have a clear picture of the meaning of the school; and second, the home must give its support to the school.

So let us plan for the deprived child; and let us meet the needs of each condition--or forget about all programs or working with the disadvantaged child and call the whole thing off!!

Teacher Panel:
"Working With Disadvantaged Children: The Teacher's Viewpoint"

an address by

Sharon Kaye Williams; Staff Teacher
Urban Laboratory in Education

In thinking over my pre-service teacher training, I realize now how much it would have helped if I had known about the disadvantaged; if I had known that the disadvantaged were not found in only slum schools or in only culturally deprived schools of large cities like New York, Los Angeles, and Chicago. I should have known that they were there, where I was, in my own home town. No one ever spoke to me about working in the socio-economically deprived areas of my town, or in any town. Instead I was being prepared--as were my classmates--to teach the "nice, average" children from the "nice" suburbs of our towns and cities. Before I was able to work with the culturally deprived children, I had to first know that they existed and that I could help them. I had been--we all had been--brainwashed to assume all schools would be middle class and average. We were not made aware of the existence of disadvantaged schools.

The education courses at my college were not completely adequate; but most education courses are not. They were severely lacking in practical application and in preparation for the kind of teaching that I am now doing. I wish now that I could have been exposed to schools from "both sides of the track" during my pre-service teacher training.

If a student teacher works in a disadvantaged school as well as an average pupiled one, he can decide which type he is best suited to work in full time. This same idea applies to grade-level training. My pre-service training was done on a secondary level; but I have found I am happiest working with the lower elementary grades. Often a teacher finds he enjoys working with a different group, too late to change (without paying a lot of summer school tuitions)!

The more varied the classroom situations of a student teacher, the greater the odds are of having a teacher who is aware of his position, one able to knowingly choose his best spot in that position. He would be able to see where his talents should be spent; so could his superiors.

I also strongly contend that every student preparing to teach school, at any level, have training in phonics and remedial reading. Slow readers are present in nearly every classroom, disadvantaged or advantaged, secondary or elementary. Assuming this, why is remedial reading an extra or optional credit course in most teacher training programs? Why not require it? Then wherever a teacher would be assigned after college he would be better prepared to cope with the reading problems so often presented.

When I began my service with the Atlanta Public Schools, great stress was put on the poverty of the urban schools. Upon my assignment to E.I.P. the orientation into the city was continued. None of the things said about scant clothing, rough discipline, low achievers, or lack of community cooperation were new to me. I even thought I understood, until I spent my first day in a fifth grade classroom. I guess seeing is believing.

I began to "see" what I had been "looking at": dirty bare feet, not necessarily dirty from a lack of desire to be clean, but dirty from no shoes to wear; and vile language used freely in the classroom. (In fact I found myself on the receiving end of a bit of that language that first day. A very rebellious young girl who did not want to take her seat told me where I might go.) Most of my first classroom experiences were a shock, but were not impossible to adjust to.

My feeling for their educational needs and their emotional adjustment is very strong. My knowledge to enable me to cope with both falls short. I began to question myself as I realized just how little I knew about what I was doing. My answers led me to the conclusion that the confusion which I face is not entirely my fault. Why didn't someone give me reason to study urban sociology? How many colleges know where their student teachers will be assigned after graduation? Very few, if any. That is why they should prepare teachers to work with all children, not just the "nice kids." The need for specialization in working with culturally disadvantaged children is necessary for one to be effective. However, a general background for all teachers would not do any harm.

If it could be done, I would suggest the teaching of "caring" in college, somewhere between existentialism and music appreciation. A teacher must learn his position in the world of children; he must learn to love. He must learn to accept his students as little individual people groping and reacting, more than acting, in the adult world.

Perhaps love is a worn-out word which connotes less logic than is required by a teacher. If so, let me try for "constructive compassion," because my children do not know they are called "disadvantaged." They don't know they need special help. I am their teacher; they are my students. They weren't anxiously awaiting the arrival of a teacher of disadvantaged children!

I cannot allow myself to pity my children. For one thing, it won't teach them anything, and for another it could easily get the best of me. Instead I am sorry they don't have shoes to wear but see that they are used to it. So I may as well accept it and get to work.

Because of the kind of teaching I do I am able to work creatively with these children. We talk a lot. During our sharing time (once I broke through the language barrier) I learn the answers to many questions I have about my children. They need so desperately to be "listened to" and not "talked at."

Through art activities they often expose their repressed emotions. These are the times when principals sometimes feel we are allowing too much free expression and seek to quell our chattering and drawing. (But only until he is out of sight!)

Their manners, morals, and ideals are very different from mine; yet I can see from their environment the reasons we differ. My values are not apropos in their rough, hard struggle to survive. I realize I cannot expect them to accept mine. I must hope that I can show them by example that there is another way to think and react. They will be able to choose then, if they feel my way is better than theirs.

Through this kind of relationship with my children I have learned to love them. As my sister innocently said, as a child, to my great-grandmother, "I like you, Granny; I just don't like your ways."

It is the responsibility of those of us in the teaching profession, now, today, to tell the ones coming behind us what it is we are doing and why. This means, of course, that we must continually re-evaluate ourselves. No transportation is faster than excitement; let's get excited over teaching. It is the most challenging and vital job I know.

Teacher Panel:
"Working With Disadvantaged Children: Implications for Teacher Education"

an address by

Dr. David E. Day; Curriculum Director
Urban Laboratory in Education

It is difficult at best to suppose one can begin to identify implications for teacher education from Misses Burbridge, Chapman, and Williams' statements. They said too much of great and sweeping importance for me to comment on completely--in just a few minutes. I shall therefore, limit myself to presenting some preliminary and, hopefully, basic issues underlying problems of preparing teachers to work with educationally disadvantaged children.

I will present seven issues. Three issues are organizational and four substantive. The organizational issues deal with relationships and responsibilities for teacher education; the remaining four substantive issues are unlike the organizational issues, primarily because resolving them is contingent upon the production of knowledge we presently are without.

All of my remarks must be prefaced by reaffirming Herbert Schueler's thesis. Poverty, deprivation, disadvantage, however defined, mean a loss of options for individuals that certainly should be available to all. Education must be a primary means by which options not presently available move closer.

Organizational Issues

1. The education of teachers begins and continues. It is time we all acted as if we believed in the cliche about continuing teacher education. Perhaps it would be valuable to think in terms of levels of teacher education. It seems clear that professional growth--like intellectual growth--is open-ended; and our proclivity for thinking in terms of terminal degrees and increment credit courses has hindered the achievement of full potential for many teachers.

2. The role of college, university, and school system in teacher education should be defined as schools and universities working collaboratively, equal strength and voice in decision making, on problems of providing adequate professional education.

It is all too gauche for university faculty to look at schools as something in need of change by professors, and for school personnel to perceive the university as an untouchable ivory tower, unrealistic and theoretical. These teachers have made it crystal clear that those who "make it" in inner city schools do so most frequently in spite of training provided by school system and university. I would guess this will continue until we can work as a professional team--drawing on the strengths of each institution. Again, I implore you to think in terms of levels of professional preparation and not in terms of pre-service, in-service, and graduate education.

I would suggest that ways in which all members of the profession could collaborate--as I have defined it--in continuing education of teachers has not really begun to be defined. The school must define its role and responsibility in society as must the university--and they are obviously different--and then proceed from an explication of role to an identification of the meaning of teacher education and how each institution can contribute to the creation of a viable program.

3. Perhaps it would be wise to think in terms of several phases of initiation to teaching, and provide appropriate support during each phase. Student teaching is one phase. Becoming an autonomous or semi-autonomous teacher is another. Learning to work with colleagues on a cooperative basis is yet another phase. It might not be unwise to think that persons becoming self-generating teachers might need a series of rather well-supported internships. The colleges and schools, it would seem, could--in working collaboratively--bring the necessary support to the teacher as he completes the "rites of passage."

It should be remembered, as we argue for maintaining vested interests and the status quo, that the three teachers said:

> 1. They had too many professional courses devoid of any field experiences and therefore less valuable than they potentially could have been.
>
> 2. They had practice taught in teaching situations totally unlike those in which they were placed when hired.
>
> 3. They were starving for help on such things as materials selection, organization of program, and most important of all, getting appropriate feedback on the degree to which they were successful teachers.

Substantive Issues

It should be quite obvious that foundation courses in college programs are less than effective in preparing teachers to work with disadvantaged children. The implication is clear. Change is needed. But to what? Where should the change be made? Is all that is necessary a greater relationship between field and text? I would suggest this is symptomatic.

If I may, I would make some suggestions. It will be necessary to examine them before they are acted upon.

1. All of us must insist that disadvantage be defined clearly and with specificity. Is a child disadvantaged if he is born and raised in a slum? How do we know? What do we mean by disadvantage? If we define disadvantage on the basis of income-per-family, a child of the slum is disadvantaged. If we define it in terms of potential life-chances, he is more than likely disadvantaged. If we define it in terms of success in school, the same could be said, although we must be cautious until the child has been given a chance to succeed or fail in school.

The point I would make is that for all too long we have defined disadvantage in terms of the modal characteristics of that portion of our population having the largest incidence of school failure. Categorizing a youngster as educationally disadvantaged because he is a Negro who lives in an urban slum is to label before knowledge.

2. Teachers must come to appreciate what we know about growth and development. The child of three is not like the child of twelve. The child who enters school at age six unprepared for success in school is not the same as a child of twelve who has had six years of accumulated school failure. Most important, we are now fairly confident that a child who is educationally disadvantaged at age six need not be disadvantaged forever. The organism can change, and the direction of change can be influenced. Somehow programs for teacher education must reflect this knowledge.

3. A third substantive issue deals with the apparent need for an increasing emphasis to be placed on the study of culture at all levels of teacher education. It is clear that people in poverty contribute the largest number of educationally disadvantaged children. We can classify the society any number of ways, but none seems to be as significant as annual income per family, if we are interested in characterizing groups who are disadvantaged. (This does not mean, nor can it be interpreted to mean, that the disadvantaged are poor or that poor people are educationally disadvantaged. It would appear that there is a greater chance of someone who is educationally disadvantaged being poor. There may be a cause and effect relationship, but we can only guess about it at this juncture.)

Sociologists and anthropologists have developed some rather interesting hunches about the existence of a culture of poverty that, I would suspect, centers around the realization that one who is in poverty in the United States is, de facto, a failure. Again I am talking about groups of people--human groups who live and interact with each other--who share similar fears, values, attitudes and aspirations. Obviously there are a range of differences within each human group, and general statements about the group are not all-inclusive.

Assuming that the perception of failure is a fact, what does this mean? One--it is new! Only recently--the past ten or twenty years--have we as a society maintained that one who does not complete school is unacceptably up-mobile.

Two--the advent of television--instant visual communication--has created a whole new pseudo culture, the world of the advertisement, that screams to the poor, "You are a failure," not because you can't smoke Salems in an imaginary meadow, but because you must realize that you will never ever be able. You are locked-in, destined to stay; and you have no control over it.

We need to continue to study the dimensions of failure with teachers; for if what I have suggested does exist, the behavior of the child from this culture will be shaped by the culture and will carry it to school.

Furthermore, and related to this point, is the notion by some anthropologists that there is a person-centered and object-centered culture in our society. The object-centered culture is made up of people like us: aggressive, interested in getting ahead, making use of social institutions such as the schools to get the good life (as we define it), shaping and ordering society to our ends.

The person-centered culture consists of those people who for numbers of reasons are not up-mobile, and aggressive, and, as a consequence, place great value on maintaining close personal relationships. They can't and don't use institutions or persons for self-agrandizement. Suffice it to say that those who are educationally disadvantaged are more apt to be person-centered than object-centered.

The last point I would like to make about the need for emphasizing a study of culture is that many teachers will be placed in culture shock when they meet the culture of a school wherein disadvantaged children are educated. This is a new world, filled with foreign values and threatening to the norms most middle class teachers embrace. Culture shock is heightened by culture conflict. We must remember each teacher said she was unprepared for what she met! They were all in a sense shocked by what was presented to them.

All I have said about the need for an increased emphasis on the study of cultural groups should not be interpreted as a contradiction of my calling for clarity in defining disadvantage. On the contrary, we will come to understand and appreciate the full range of human response in any group as we study and learn about that group.

4. It was suggested before our meeting began that we restrict our

concerns to the realities of the existent teaching situation. One can understand this and have full sympathy for the position if he hopes any kind of immediate action will result from the conference. It would be futile to become overly concerned with the problem of classes of thirty-five disadvantaged children if there were no ways of reducing the load--regardless of the fact that we know with this many children a teacher--not to mention the children--is lost, before she begins.

However, I must raise a question that seems to me to have implications for teacher education and at the same time treats issues that some might suggest would transcend our ability to modify them. Is it possible we are all engaged in trying to prepare teachers for an educational system that is archaic and, in terms of disadvantaged children, almost guaranteed to produce failure? Put another way, is there an alternative to the present structure of American education that would be more apt to produce success in the education of disadvantaged children?

I think there is a better alternative, but I am convinced that until we divest ourselves of the encumbrances of false philosophies about the nature of education, how it should be conducted, and relationships between what is known and how to discover knowledge; we will not achieve a significant change in the structure of education. We educators must not be fearful of examining all possible options to the present ways in which children and teachers are organized and in which attitudes and knowledge are transmitted. This is especially imperative as it regards the education of those children who are certain to fail, though not their fault, under the present structure of education.

"What Teachers Need to Know"

an address by

Dr. Doxey A. Wilkerson,
Associate Professor of Education
Yeshiva University, New York City

I am expected to tell you what teachers need to know and be able to do in order to function effectively with socially disadvantaged children. Following this morning's session I was strongly of the opinion, and somewhat still am, that you might well dispense with my speech. I thought that the answer was most effectively given by the ladies on that panel and much more dramatically than I can give it, because it grew out of their own concrete experiences in the classroom. But the show must go on. So let me address myself to some hunches, at least, in this area.

To define the frame of reference, I shall make four or five points here. When we talk about disadvantaged children in the Atlanta area, I take it we are talking mainly about lower-class Negro children who live in the ghetto, and who are having difficulties in school, presumably as a result of the negative influences of their environment. When we talk about working successfully with such children, I assume that we mean getting them to learn--guiding the progressive development of important human beings, academically, socially, emotionally. We have rejected the much-too-common custodial view of "working successfully" with these children, supplanting it with a criterion of the optimal development of children as a measure of success.

Underlying the discussion, as of our whole workshop, I think, is the assumption--most eloquently expressed last night by Dr. Schueler--that working successfully with lower-class Negro children of the ghetto in the inner-city schools requires some special knowledges, special abilities, and special feelings, which may or may not be significant with teachers of more advantaged children. Incidentally, I am coming more and more to the view that advantaged children don't need good teachers anyway. The failures of the school are generally compensated for by their homes. But disadvantaged children are in a situation where the school must compensate for inadequacies in their home backgrounds. The successes of children in suburban areas are not attributable mainly to the skills and effectiveness of their teachers, but largely to the effectiveness of their homes.

For any teachers, and by teachers I mean "guiders of learning," there are certain professional insights and skills which are required equipment. Teachers must be able to conceive and formulate growth objectives which are to be outcomes of what they are doing in school. They must be able to select learning activities and instructional materials for furthering those goals. They must be able to organize such learning activities into meaningful instructional experiences and to appraise the outcomes and evaluate the effectiveness of what has been done. These professional insights and skills are true of all teachers. Our concern here is with the special teacher knowledges and behaviors necessary for the education of the population group which we are calling "disadvantaged children."

I wish I could tell you with certainty the precise knowledges, skills, and behaviors of teachers which would make for effective learning by disadvantaged children. But you know as well as I do that the science of education has not developed to this point. Most of what we are doing is on the basis of hunches. Little has been tested systematically. When it comes to the education of disadvantaged children, we enter into a realm where there are many conflicting views, stemming from different experiences, outlooks, and psychological orientations.

Since prescription must necessarily follow diagnosis, whether implicitly or not, let me begin by calling attention to what appear to be some of the special instructional problems to which teachers must address themselves in the inner-city school. I have chosen to focus mainly on learning problems from the point of view of the learner, as the teacher sees them.

First, and in a sense really encompassing all the rest, is the pattern of low achievement that we find characteristic in depressed-area schools. Children just are not learning at the pace and to the degree which we have come to expect as the norm. They don't respond in the accustomed way to the patterns of treatment which we've habituated ourselves to giving in school.

Second, is what we call the low academic motivation characteristic of many of these children. Not only are they not learning very well, but they don't care and are not eager to learn. They don't respond to the usual academic rewards and punishments that we offer. They evince little concern for really acquiring the knowledges and skills that we are trying to give them.

Third, and still related--indeed they are all inter-related--is the question of low self-esteem, poor ego-control, or negative self-concept. They have learned from their experiences that they "just don't have it"; they don't anticipate that they are going to be able to do what we're demanding that they do in the school. Sometimes they evince such attitudes by quiet withdrawal, self-abnegation; sometimes, more healthfully, by rebellion and aggressive revolt. The feelings that "we just don't have it" is not an uncommon one; indeed, it's a highly common one among the youngsters that we're speaking of as our target population.

A fourth problem is what we euphemistically call "normvaring conduct," or more commonly "disciplinary problems." I have been impressed with many of the surveys which have suggested that in many of the slum schools, eighty per cent or more of the time is spent trying to keep the kids from climbing the walls. If this is true, this fact alone is enough to explain inadequate achievement. Not much time is devoted to instruction; rather the time is spent largely in trying to curb unruly conduct. It is, of course, in relation to this conduct that new teachers experience the phenomenon of "culture shock."

A fifth problem, which manifests itself in different ways, is a conflict with the home. Perhaps most generally it is manifested as a meager parental support of the school program. We have learned that we don't go very far in any of our school programs unless they are supported by the families from which the youngsters come; and if the home is indifferent or is working at cross-purposes, our success in the school is affected. At times, this school-home alienation is manifested in direct and overt conflict, as currently in New York City's Harlem. Perhaps this is not characteristic yet in Atlanta.

Here then are five main problem areas to which teacher education for working with disadvantaged children should be addressed. The question before us now is what do teachers need to know in order to work with them effectively; what do they need to be able to do? What I have to say here is largely supportive of what was so effectively said in the panel this morning.

There are two big areas of teacher behavior and knowledges which I think we might posit as a framework for the discussion. One has to do with insights which stem from the behavioral and social sciences--biology, anthropology, psychology, sociology, history. The other includes insights and skills of a professional character.

In the behavioral and social sciences area, it is especially important for teachers to understand the biological and social forces which shape human development. What makes children develop the way they do? What can make them develop the way we would like them to? As an illustration we might ask what is the genesis of intellectual ability? How does it develop? What influences shape its development? It's important for teachers of disadvantaged children to be freed from what has traditionally been taught about a "fixed intelligence" based upon genetic inheritance. Far too long has this now outmoded belief provided us with a rationale for not teaching kids who score low on intelligence tests. Teachers need to become acquainted with some of the work of Piaget, and of Hunt, commonly referred to as the "interactionist view" of the development of intellectual function. This view holds that the quality of intellectual function is not determined by the genes, but by the nature of the organism's encounters with his environment. The nature of these interactions determines in large measure the course and pace of the development of intellectual function.

Related is the question of achievement--expectation. Most of us have learned that pupil behavior is, among other things, a function of teacher behavior--and often in ways that we sometimes don't perceive. I suspect you have seen some of the studies which have shown that when kids seem to think that their teachers expect them to learn, they do. And when youngsters perceive their teachers not expecting them to learn, they don't. I've always been fascinated by that interesting experiment conducted at the University of North Dakota, by graduate students of psychology given rats to run through the maze. They were to see how long it took their rats to learn to run the maze without error. One group of students was told that their rats were found, after pretesting, to be "maze-bright"; and the other group of students was told that their rats were "maze-dull." Yet, those rats that the psychology graduate students thought were maze-bright learned to run the maze faster than the rats thought to be maze-dull. Now if you ask me to explain how the experimenters conveyed to their subjects their differing expectations and got corresponding feedback, I would be hard-pressed. But if somehow it got over to the rats, then I'm sure we have little difficulty in conveying to our youngsters in the classroom what we expect of them. If we have access to intelligence test scores (as most of us do) which we assume tell us something about the genetic antecedents of these youngsters--or at least limitations placed by a "fixed intelligence" upon their potential for achievement--we tend to expect them to perform in accordance with their I.Q. ratings; and the pupils tend, indeed, to perform in accordance with our expectations.

In respectable professional circles, we no longer call upon the I.Q. to rationalize our failures. We may do it covertly, but we don't say it out loud any more because the I.Q. has lost its aura. In recent years, however, we have developed another rationalization that is just as good, if not better. We now say: this child may have come into the world with as much intellectual potential as any child in the universe; but unfortunately he has been so scarred by his depressed home and community experiences, his limited experiential opportunities, the negative attidudinal influences which have played a role in his development that he is "culturally deprived"; he is thus incapable of learning what we want him to learn in school. So we are off the hook again. Implicit, of course, is the assumption that limitations stemming from this background are almost as fixed as we used to think the I.Q. was.

In this area of behavioral science understanding, teachers need to know something of experimental work and demonstrations which have shown that many youngsters who have been scarred by their pre-school social experiences, coming to school not so well equipped for its work as children from more advantaged homes, can nevertheless, and do, achieve and perform well academically when given appropriate experiences in school.

I was much interested in the most recent follow-up on the Skeels-Skodak "Iowa Studies." Back in the '30's and early '40's, Skeels and Skodak were working with some kids in orphanages. They were poor kids. They'd all been tested and adjudged mentally retarded. It was too crowded in the orphanage, so about half of them were transferred to a special institution for kids whose intellectual ability is severely limited, children classified as feeble-minded. It was found, after a period of time, that the kids who had been put into this institution, when retested, had increased in their I.Q. Skeels and Skodak hypothesized that the environment in the institution for feeble-minded was considerably more stimulating than that of the orphanage.

In time, some of these youngsters were placed in foster homes; whereas others remained in the institutions. Ever since, they've been followed up periodically. In the last follow-up when they were about 25 or 30 years old--just 2 or 3 years ago--Skeels and Skodak discovered sharp contrasts between those who were placed in foster homes and those who were not. Among those who did not go into foster homes, not a single one has finished elementary school; several have died; none is married; one or two have some kind of menial job; none is self-supporting; and all have been wards of the state for a long, long, time. It is a sorry picture of some thoroughly defeated youngsters. But among the other group, who tested lower than this control group to begin with, and who went into foster homes, all are self-supporting; all have gone to various degrees of education--one of them finished college, several had one or two years of college, most of them have finished high school; none are wards of the state; many of them are married. One young lady, who had an initial I.Q. of 35, now has two children, one of whom tests at an I.Q. of 128 and the other at I.Q. 107. This is a picture of human beings one would never assume once belonged to the "feeble-minded" class. They are successful, effective human beings. The difference between the two groups is that they had different kinds of life experience, sharply contrasting encounters with their environment.

There is considerable evidence that, even after children have entered school, learning disadvantages stemming from social limitations can be overcome. Illustrative is a demonstration by Dr. Kenneth Clark with children from Harlem brought into his northside Center for Child Development. These were Negro and Puerto Rican youngsters with all the social disabilities which we are talking about. Five days a week, one hour a day, they were given special remedial work in reading. At the end of a five-week period, the average child there had raised his reading level by 2.7 grade levels. In the fall these youngsters went back to their regular schools. At the end of nine months they were tested again. The average gain at the end of nine months was 0. It is obvious that we are dealing with something here that is not just the function of the learner's potential for development; it is rather a function of the experiences with which the learner is confronted. There are many other evidences that learning handicaps born of social disability are reversible, given appropriate school experiences to this end. Teachers need to know this. I have emphasized this area of behavioral-science understanding because I know how fundamentally important it is for teachers to have confidence that their pupils can learn.

Another area that I think warrants special emphasis in teacher education has to do with the socialization process, particularly primary socialization within the family and its impact upon the developing youngster. How is it that he develops his language patterns, his values, his norms of conduct? What indeed are the social influences which are involved here? How did they happen to be? A teacher who is not alien to but has studied and had some field experiences interacting with lower-class populations within the urban ghetto--who understands and empathizes with the population we're talking about--is in a better position to avoid some of the "cultural shock" that was described here this morning, a common characteristic of many teachers moving into ghetto schools. If he can understand some of the non-normative behavior among ghetto kids, the teacher is able to realize that the children are reacting, not against him, but against the frustrations of their whole life experiences. Teachers need to have some systematic study of the sub-culture which tends to prevail in the inner-city community.

Another area in which teachers need knowledge has to do with Negro history. Most of the discussions that we read today about Negro self-concept emphasize that many of these youngsters see failure from birth to the grave in their families. They don't have success-models at home because their parents, themselves, have been defeated. Frequently they are told "You ain't nothing, and you ain't going no place." Most of the life experiences these youngsters have say this to them. After they come into the school situation, they fail when confronted with only our conventional approaches to teaching. They soon learn that they're nobody. They even generalize that Negroes are nobody and are going no place. Their school experiences tend to reinforce the negative impact of their slum environment.

Although I'm not trying to suggest a prescription for dealing with this problem of self-concept, I do think that some contribution can be made by teachers who know something about Negro history, about the Negro's changing relations to American society, and about the African background. I have been impressed with how meaningful it seems to be to some Negro children to learn that their forefathers in Africa were not just savages running around like wild animals, but included noble men and women of great empires in developing culture. It would also be important to communicate to these kids the very significant role played by masses of Negroes, as well as outstanding individuals, in the history of the United States. It would be especially important for them to know something of the Negro's relation to the society following the Civil War and Reconstruction, the aftermath when the promise of Reconstruction was defeated and Negroes were pushed back into virtual slavery, where many people in our country were convinced they were going to stay. Also to be included would be the whole series of events since those times when Negroes have been getting out of "their place" and conducting such vigorous and effective struggles as those of the Civil Rights Movement in the 1960's.

The teacher who has an understanding of the processes of social change, the influences involved, and how they are reflected in the developing relations of Negroes to American society, is better equipped to let her children know that their inferior status in the society is a result of factors not attributable to their nature, but to impersonal and conscious social forces; and that these forces can be and are in the process of being changed. I'm inclined to think that a teacher who can convey such understandings to Negro children because she has the relevant knowledge is most likely to enable such youngsters, first, to see themselves more objectively in relationship to the social structure of which they're a part; and second, to give them some measure of confidence that there is a future for each of them. She can get them to understand that what now prevails has not always prevailed, nor will it; and that they can play a role in effecting the change.

Now this is by no means an exhaustive list of behavioral and social science knowledges which I think are important for teachers of disadvantaged children to know. They are but illustrative. We need to augment substantially the liberal education of teachers; to broaden their intellectual horizons, liberating them from the fetters of unscientific beliefs and social myths; to make them more at home with important areas of their culture; and to give them some of the conceptual tools with which problem solving must proceed.

I will have to deal briefly with the second big area of teacher-education needs I mentioned, that of professional understandings and skills.

First, a professional acquaintance of mine at the City University of New York, reported a study which bears this title: "Children's Perceptions of Their Teachers' Feelings Toward Them Related to Self-Perception, School Achievement, and Behavior." It shows a very close relationship among these factors, and points up a professional insight which is important, because it emphasizes the heavy responsibility those of us in the profession must bear for the kinds of outcomes we get in school.

Second, and extremely important, is the need of teachers to know how to individualize instruction. We've been saying this in our education courses for as long as I've been in teacher education (and that's a lot of decades); but we rarely teach teachers how to individualize instruction. We just tell them, "you must do it." But there are not many teachers who come out of teacher education institutions who really know how to go about individualizing instruction. The conventional approach to instruction is a big stumbling-block to any significant development by disadvantaged youngsters, who don't come to the school with the more-or-less common set of developed skills, attitudes, behaviors, knowledges of the middle-class background. They instead come to school enormously varied, with many gaps in their experiences which are not the same from child to child. If there's any place where focusing our instruction on the specific learning needs of individual children is important, it's in the inner-city school. We need to know how continually to diagnose the needs and the gaps of such youngsters, to adapt programs which vary among the youngsters to their varying needs, to appraise results and modify programs. In a special teacher education program that I work with at Yeshiva, one of the most effective things we do is to include in the regular teaching-of-reading course sixteen extended sessions in a reading clinic. Here the student teachers work with "live" children of varying abilities and disabilities whom they test, diagnose, and prescribe treatment for. The whole approach is towards individualizing reading instruction, using the skills-center technique. The prospective teachers actually learn how to individualize instruction in reading, which is perhaps the most important curriculum area involved in the early schooling of disadvantaged children.

Third, and closely related, is the knowledge of how to prepare instructional materials which are appropriate for disadvantaged children with varying needs. Here I have in mind the great inappropriateness of the standard materials in many of our books. Most teachers perceive the inadequacy of these materials for working with disadvantaged children. So they say: "We need better materials; why don't they give us more appropriate materials?," whether it be in reference to reading levels or in reference to integrating the characters in the books. Increasingly now publishers are turning out materials which are relevant. But what we need is for teachers to come to understand the necessity for developing their own instructional materials in the light of their own classes and the individuals in those classes--and to be able to do it. This, of course, is no little order; nor is effective teaching. Not only must we individualize instruction; we must also develop creative materials of our own which are appropriate for the children we are dealing with.

Fourth, teachers need to know what parents of inner-city children really are like, and they need to be able to interact effectively with them. I am ever impressed with the stereotypes of impoverished Negro parents which our teacher-trainees have when they enter our program. They have never met any; they have never been in their homes. Instead, they have built up misleading stereotypes. The big change in attitudes and insights comes when they visit the homes and interact with the parents of inner-city youngsters. We have found home-visitation of great value in both pre-service and in-service teacher education. It also does big things for the child to perceive that his teacher thinks it important to come to his home. And it does important things for the parent whose support the school must have.

Finally, let me add one other point, which was brought up in this morning's panel. It relates to how to "beat the system." Teachers really do need to know how to "beat" this bureaucratic school system which we've built up over the decades, and which prescribes and proscribes, like any bureaucracy. You and I know that creative teaching doesn't fit into the conventional school straight-jacket. How to beat the system and still keep your job, and do a decent job with your children, is certainly a nice question. I'm not supposed to tell you how to do these things; I'm asked merely to tell you "What Teachers Need to Know." But I have learned through observation that there are many teachers who are good at beating the system.

There is a great deal of freedom that teachers have in their own classrooms. Some people decry the fact that there is not much supervision of teachers in our schools; but sometimes it's a blessing! For most of the day the teacher is free to do what she will. She does not _have_ to go on teaching lessons to the kids if they are meaningless to them. Most of the effective teachers I know scrap the course of study, except when somebody is looking. They prepare lesson plans that say the "right" things; and if anybody wants to look at them, they can do so. Then these teachers go ahead to try to give the kids truly meaningful experiences in the school, beating the system.

The behavioral-social science understandings and professional insights and skills that we have been talking about focus mainly upon teacher needs, not upon pupil needs; although they are inferred from what we think to be certain pupil needs. This emphasis is a little different from the prevailing emphasis in the field of compensatory education. The prevailing tendency is to concentrate upon the _lacks_ of the disadvantaged child. I had occasion a couple of years ago to do a survey of all the research work done in this field, and I was impressed with the fact that around 90% of all the research articles and studies reported were addressed to the question "What's wrong with this kid?" and hence, "What do we need to do to change him?"

The tendency for many of us working in the field is to focus here, on what is "wrong" with the disadvantaged child; but doing so is not often conducive to the optimum development of such children. Two tendencies emerge: one, for us in this very defensive profession to rationalize our failures in terms of the child's deficits, stemming from his parents and the community; or the other, for us to become frustrated as we try to do more and more and more, while the child fails to respond and produce the expected results. In either case, the burden of responsibility--we say--is upon the child and his inadequacies, "wherever they came from."

This emphasis is misplaced. We must come clearly to understand that the school must change radically before we can get the disadvantaged children in the school to change. This is a fundamental premise that should underlie most of our efforts in the area of compensatory education. The burden of proof is upon us and our school systems; we have failed. I often argue with students over my definition of teaching, which is "guiding learning." It follows from this definition that if the learner has not learned, for whatever reason, then the teacher has not taught him. The emphasis is placed upon the teacher and the school. If children don't learn, it means that we have not been able or willing to guide them in the necessary learning experiences. If we take such a point of view, and operate with the premise that the primary target for change is the school (as a necessary pre-condition for the changes that we want in the behaviors of children), then I think that we must realize that we're going to have to staff our schools with people who have much deeper understandings of the influences shaping human development than those who now predominate. We will need people who have a functional command of insights stemming from the behavioral and social sciences; who have certain special professional skills and insights relevant to the special learning problems of disadvantaged children. We will need teachers who are equipped with much more than a professional bag of tricks, who approach teaching as a problem-solving endeavor, and who have the liberal and professional educational tools for coping with and solving the varying problems involved in guiding learning.

There is no valid "cook-book" guide to effective teaching with any learners, and least of all with those who enter our schools handicapped by the negative influences of poverty and discrimination. What teachers need most is not a set of guiding maxims which are deemed "practical" for work with disadvantaged children; rather, their most pressing needs are scientific insights into the psychological and sociological forces shaping the development of such children, certain professional know-hows, and especially a creative approach to the special academic and emotional problems reflected in the inner-city classroom.

An Address

by

Dr. Hobart Burns, Vice-President
San Jose State College
San Jose, California

My sense of logic suggests I define the problem as I see it, or at least discuss some of the parameters, for we all know a problem undefined is a problem unlikely to be solved.

In clear language, the problem is that American public education has failed to help enough children from the lower socio-economic strata enter the main stream of our society. That is to put it gently. To put it less gently, schools prevent many children from doing so. As the recent report of the Civil Rights Commission documented, the longer disadvantaged children stay in school the further behind they fall.

If that is not the single major problem in education today, then I volunteer to turn in my cap and gown. And if it is the major problem, many of us should have our caps, gowns, and gold tassels taken away.

Why do our schools fail in this respect, when they have been fairly successful with most middle class children? I suspect, at the simplest level of diagnosis, it is because schools have not been geared to the education of the disadvantaged, because they lack the know-how and the know-why, not to mention the will.

If this is the case, if this is anywhere near the truth, then our first task is to examine the ends now being served by the schools and identify those that should be served. The reasoning here is that means and ends are inextricably related, and if eventually we want to talk about the education of teachers we will not be very successful unless we first talk about what we want teachers to be able to do. And of course, what we want teachers to be able to do is, in turn, dependent upon what we want our students to be able to do--or, at least, what the process of education should do to or for students.

So we start with ends, not means; with the purposes rather than the procedures of education. Put succinctly, we need to know what kinds of products--students--we want before we can design a teacher education system to train teachers who can produce the students we want.

For instance, as John Dewey noted decades ago, if we want our students to be unquestioning, passive, accepting, conforming individuals when they are adults, ready to do as they are told and ready to accept and defend the status quo as an eternal verity, then we shall want to train teachers in a very different way than if we wanted students to become curious, active, questioning, independent individuals who are ready, able, and willing to function in our highly interdependent, complex, ever-changing, technological, and increasingly urbanized society.

It is within our present state of the art to produce either kind of teacher, either kind of student. As a matter of fact we produce both kinds now, although, I am ashamed to say, the evidence suggests we seem to produce more of the former than of the latter, perhaps because this is easier to do.

Thus as my colleague on the National NDEA Institute, Arthur Pearl from the University of Oregon, notes: If we want the former kind of student, we need more teachers whose stance is to demand formal respect from children, to order specific performance from children, to crush opposition to teacher-will and authority. And, in view of the teacher shortage, let me suggest that superintendents wanting this kind of teacher think about recruiting graduates of police academies or military schools where riot control, suppression of guerilla insurrection, and military government are a part of the curriculum.

For my part, and I hope yours, I don't want a socity of conforming, uniform adults; and so I don't want schools which, in effect, demand conformity of behavior and uniformity of thought on the part of students, by insecure authoritarian teachers whose teacher education was neither educative nor productive of a teacher. There is a difference between teaching and school keeping.

In a moment I propose to be more positive and constructive. But right now permit me to be critical, critical of us. Here my theme is drawn from one of my favorite philosophers, Pogo, who once said, "I have seen the enemy, and he is us!"

In a real sense we are the enemy, at least in part. We are members of the Establishment, and we are part of the problem.

If for no other reason this is so because we know of the phoniness, the irrelevance of much of what goes on in public education and teacher education. We have and we live with this guilty knowledge--but few of us, including me, do much of anything to make the curriculum relevant;

to weed out incompetent teachers and administrators; to call a spade a spade, especially if it is a board member or local politico who is using that dirty shovel; or do much of anything even to reform an educational system--that may need a revolution, rather than a reformation, if it is to become alert, alive, and contributory to the social, economic, and political needs of a modern society rapidly nearing the fourth quarter of the twentieth century.

We are now educating children whose lives will be lived as much or more in the next century as in this one; but our schools are still based on structures and functions more apropos to the earlier part of this century (if not the last) than the next.

This is really a terrible indictment, for it accuses us of the most grievous educational felony: curricular and pedagogical irrelevance, contributing to the intellectual delinquency of minors, and thereby endangering the foundations of a free, open, pluralistic society.

We must know this. There isn't a person here who doesn't know that our schools are sick because our society is sick; there isn't a person here who doesn't know it is morally wrong and educationally destructive to segregate students; every one of us knows that, as Harvard's Pettigrew says, "We are committing educational genocide on the next generation of Negro children;" we know that our schools and colleges are not yet doing anything dramatically significant, on a large enough scale, to make even a dent in the problem.

Of course we are not guilty of all this; we know our own sins, and we know we're not all _that_ bad--yet. But it seems to me an honest sense of reality coupled with our professional conscience would suggest we might do well to cop the plea of contributory negligence.

If teachers have been negligent, and especially so concerning the education of disadvantaged youth, I suspect it is because most of them simply _do not know how_ to make a significant or even relevant contribution. And this is to say, in large measure, that they have no clear ideas of educational ends, or purposes, in mind. Most teachers, reflecting their teacher-training, are all means and no ends, rendering them unable to evaluate, in any respectable way, the efficacy of their means.

So we come full circle: to know what kinds of teachers we want, we need a clear conception of the kinds of students we want to produce--a clear idea of the goals of education pertinent to a modern, technological, free and open society.

I suggest we _can_ identify such goals, and can do so in operational rather than metaphysical terms. I suggest such goals, expressed in terms of what we want students to be able to do, will yield clear signals as to how schools should be organized and conducted. This, in turn, will yield signals about how teachers need to be trained if they are to function well in schools designed to achieve the ends of education demanded by a modern political and economic society.

There are several such major ends of education as I see them; but they are all related to the larger goal of preserving and extending our individual and collective freedom. Consequently, an orderly sense of procedure suggests that since I have coupled education with freedom, I offer for your intellectual audit my premises--for what follows is based on them, and you are entitled to examine the first principles as well as the conclusions.

These premises can be encapsulated in the words of Thomas Jefferson who, writing to Colonel Charles Yancy in 1814, said "A nation that expects to be both free and ignorant . . . expects what never was and never will be."

This is nothing less than to say the safety and future of the Republic is dependent upon the quantity and quality of education available in the Republic. It is to say, in effect, that our schools are--or should be--the bulwark of our freedom. But to say this is to say little, other than to offer a cliche to which most will pay allegiance until we have an operational definition of freedom. Let me offer one. Whatever else we may or may not mean, it seems there are three crucial ingredients in freedom. The first is the existence of alternatives.

If man or society has no alternative, freedom can be only illusory. If there is nothing other to do than what one is doing, man is not free but determined. If no other possible course of action exists, if behavior cannot be altered, then we are merely puppets working out a predetermined blueprint for life.

But if one alternative exists, if there is some other possible course of action, then the seed of freedom exists. Granted it has not yet sprouted, and certainly not bloomed; but it _is_ there--and one of the preconditions of freedom has been met.

The second ingredient is _choice_. No matter that one or many alternatives for behavior exist, if we cannot choose from among them! If our ability to identify alternatives, evaluate their likely consequences, and choose one on the basis of desire or need is impaired, to that extent choice and freedom are impaired. But with the existence of alternatives and the ability to identify and elect a preferred course of action, the seed of freedom has grown and we can see--in the choices available--it is a many-flowered thing.

The third ingredient is _power_. Even if alternatives exist, and even if we have identified them and chosen among them, we have no real freedom unless we have the power to act upon a choice, to implement it, actually to _do_ it. What does it mean to choose to buy a solid gold Cadillac if one is a pauper? What does it mean to choose to be a doctor, lawyer, or corporation chief if one cannot command the power of an education? What does it mean to choose to vote if one lacks the power to get registered?

In this sense the existence of alternatives and the right and ability to choose are necessary, but insufficient, conditions of freedom; to them _must_ be added the condition of power--the ability to act upon a choice and so realize the chosen alternative. (And in this context, let me add that Stokeley Carmichael and Floyd McKissick have been more perceptive than most; for they see that it is a contradiction in terms to speak of freedom without at the same time speaking of power.)

So the components of freedom are alternatives, choice, and power. But note here the common thread that runs through all of them: the need for knowledge, for information. Knowledge is the father of freedom, and that which stifles knowledge, or restricts education, or limits inquiry, to that degree stifles, restricts, and limits freedom. And conversely, that which spreads and expands knowledge, extends and enlarges education, and promotes and cherishes inquiry also increases and improves freedom.

So, as Jefferson intimated, education is the bulwark of democracy. And from this it takes no genius to see that the over-riding ends of education in an open society must be to make alternatives available to students, to give them the intellectual wherewithal to identify alternatives and make choices, and to provide them with knowledge that can be transformed into the power to act upon their choices. The teacher or the school that fails to contribute to this end fails his student and his society. And I offer you my judgment that too many schools and too many teachers are failures.

But if this is the major end of education, what does it mean a little more specifically? A little more specifically, and cast in terms of students, it means that the school must do three things (which Arthur Pearl has perceptively elaborated):

1. To give each student a real choice of careers.
2. To give each student a real ability to be an active citizen--to function in an open society.

3. To give each student the intra- and inter-personal skills really needed if he is going to function--to live, work, play--in a complex, interdependent, and probably bureaucratic society.

There are other goals, of course, some major (such as making children into culture carriers) and some minor (such as teaching middle class English, spoken without a Southern accent, Midwestern twang, Western drawl, Boston nasality, or the atrocity that passes in downstate New York for English). But none is so important, in my judgment, as the three I have identified for your scrutiny and analysis.

Let me comment on these, especially in reference to the so-called disadvantaged, by which we normally mean Negroes, when in fact we should mean all kinds of poor--Spanish-Americans, American Indians, and a good many white, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant, and Catholic Americans as well. Which is only to say that poverty and deprivation and disadvantagement are not a function of genetics but of socio-economics, of a socio-economic system, including a sub-system called education, which has historically, systematically, effectively--and sometimes deliberately--denied many individuals and groups entry into the affluent society.

But let me comment on these three goals. First, the end of giving students real career choices. Here by way of overview I can try to drive home my point by using Arthur Pearl's definition of a disadvantaged student: a kid who has no credit cards.

That definition is really a masterful double-entendre. In the one meaning, who can deny that, in our modern economy, he who is denied a credit card is disadvantaged? And in the second and deeper meaning, who can deny that ours is a credentialled society; and he who lacks or is denied the proper credentials--the most basic of which is a high school diploma--is surely disadvantaged and therefore condemned to a marginal life? All this is to say--as any undergraduate economics major can tell us--that our modern economy less and less needs unskilled and semi-skilled labor; that employment is more and more organizational, bureaucratic, and de-personalized, and that any fruitful entrance into the money economy requires the completion of formal education requirements, usually some post-secondary education.

Since this is the case, the schools--which is to say, teachers and administrators--simply must keep every student "alive." That is, every single student who wants to go to college has got to be given a chance to go to college.

But, as we all know, the elementary and secondary school is a screening device which in effect screens out and discourages the disadvantaged from going on to higher education. At the same time it encourages the already-advantaged to do so; thus, in the process, stratifying society more than it is and contributing not only to a class society but to a caste society. Fifty or one hundred years ago, education opened and loosened society; it was a democratizing influence. But today it is closing, tightening and rigidifying society; because today, as never before in our society, educational success is highly correlated with parental socio-economic position. The partial meaning of this is that knowing little more than parental occupation and income, we can predict with frightening accuracy the child's academic career. The full meaning is that kids who most need the school are pushed-out or dropped-out.

The tragedy is that rather than solving this problem the school is contributing to it. Most schools, because they expect less from these students, give them less and are satisfied with less from them. They are segregated by ability and continue to fall behind until, at some point--usually by junior high--they are lost. The school has not saved them; it has condemned them. It has put into operation a self-sustaining hypothesis that to be disadvantaged is to be dumb, and to be dumb is to be fit only for the vocational track--a track which, almost invariably, is not really vocational but just a dumping ground for students until they can be dumped on a declining labor market without any salable skills. Here the simple truth is that many youth become disaffected with school because the school _is_ irrelevant: it does _not_ provide them either with an entry to college or with an entry to the world of work. And they fail, in life as in school, because the school has failed them. We like to blame the kid, or his home, or his ancestral genetics, or his peers--or _anything_ but the school. Maybe some of these contributed; but so did the school. And that means us.

It is the school which has stamped the student as a failure, a judgment the student too often accepts. It is the school which has surrendered responsibility, and stigmatized the student; and it is the school which, for some peculiar reason related to our economic system, scorns effort unless it leads to success and, in so doing, humiliates the losers.

Thus the school too often fails in its task to identify and open career alternatives, to help students make a wise choice of career, and to give them the power to enter that career.

On the second goal, does the school give disadvantaged students a real ability to be an active citizen in an open society, as the second goal requires? I think the answer is obvious; and one reason why these students learn little of democratic processes in school is because almost all schools, so far as the student is concerned, are authoritarian institutions run by rigid, fearful administrators and conducted by teachers who only dimly perceive their role in promoting citizenship and participation because they are blinded by the assumption that a curriculum consists only of formal subject matter--and the student who questions being force-fed a pre-digested, often irrelevant, curriculum is ipso facto a "bad citizen."

Very few schools prepare students for active, effective participation in the political life of our communities, if only because that is too dangerous--and assuming they even knew how.

And what of the third goal: giving the disadvantaged the inter- and intra-personal skills needed to survive in an open society? Again we are failing. Alienation and anomie are growing because schools, especially colleges, are depersonalized. We are all becoming numbers, and the school has become an institution which is destroying rather than promoting individuality. The system is so complex; the school demands conformity; and the students must shape up or ship out--and since schools are not very effective at helping the disadvantaged to shape up, they ship out.

And teachers, too, are subject to alienation, feelings of insignificance, and a sense of powerlessness. Many have little confidence in themselves, fear they are only minimally competent--and so they are not about to venture into new areas, or build innovative programs on their own initiative. Any why should they? There is very little in the organization of the school which encourages and rewards independence and innovation.

And so, the school handles student deviancy by segregation. Students are put in special classes--for the slow learner, the gifted learner, the disturbed, the unruly, and so on--until differences between human beings are reinforced, made strange to others, and group intercourse and accommodation are made more and more difficult.

Thus, if the end of education is to serve as means to promoting a free society; and if by freedom we mean the identification and extension of alternatives, the analysis and making of choices, and the generation of power to act; and if, in education, this means giving all students a choice of entering the economy with real career preparation, preparing them to function in a democratic society, and helping them develop the inter-personal skills needed for survival in our complex society; then, for the middle-class student we have had some fair success. But for the lower-class student, especially our disadvantaged Negro and Spanish minorities, we have simply failed.

We have failed, I suppose, because it is true that our schools do mirror the society in which they exist and which supports them. And our society has not, until recently, _really_ cared about the 20% of poor, disadvantaged citizens. Separate and unequal is still the _leit motif_ in the nation's schools, be they in Birmingham or Boston, New Orleans or New York, Chattanooga or Chicago, Atlanta or Los Angeles.

And here lies the dilemma: we know, from the Coleman Report, that a really superior school for Negroes must be integrated; we know, from the Civil Rights Report, that after thirteen years of court order, demonstrations, and pressure from three presidents, educational segregation is increasing, not decreasing; and at the same time we know that the average white American is not yet ready to do what must be done to integrate all children in schools. We know, too, from the McCone Report, that if we do not integrate, our cities will be transformed into hideous reservations for the Negro poor; and since the white majority can hardly expect Negroes to accept this with passive resignation, we run the risk of becoming a repressive society.

It is a dilemma that we cannot expect the school alone to solve, and certainly not the way our schools are presently organized, funded, administered, and conducted. If and when the schools are able to make a deeply significant contribution to the education of disadvantaged youth, they will be as different from the schools of today as those of today are from the academies and Latin schools of yesteryear. I suspect this kind of change will not be volunteered at the local level, by local school boards or administrators.

In this gloomy context, what is to be said of teacher preparation? At least this: that with reference to preparing teachers for any kind of student, teacher education is:

- too remote from the public schools and classroom practice;
- based on theory that is irrelevant and inapplicable;
- contaminated by values which all but preclude effective instruction of poor children;
- negligent in the preparation and use of para-professionals, especially those who are from the adult disadvantaged;
- subjected to a fragmented curriculum, with little articulation between theory and practice, method and content;
- foreshortened in power, due to the limited universe of candidates it attracts; and finally,
- just as Willard Waller once said, "A teacher is a man hired to tell lies to little boys," too many professors of education are teaching lies about the schools because they don't know the reality in the schools.

What should be done? I'm not sure, except that it must be made more relevant. So let me work up to a conclusion by suggesting an alternative I'm not sure I'd endorse. But it is worth exploring.

Many colleges, perhaps even most, have not taken seriously their obligation to teacher education, especially the over-riding social obligation to train teachers for the disadvantaged. Since they have not, since they cannot be forced into active social responsibility, and since in any case the most relevant place to train teachers is where teaching is going on, should we not consider transferring the responsibility from colleges and universities to the public schools?

In public higher education this would involve a simple shift of funds, along with responsibility, from higher to public education--so it need not cause any fiscal problem though one would hear the screams of anguish from professors of education who would, perhaps for the first time, be threatened with the necessity of either getting out in the real world of teaching or getting out of education. Hopefully, many would choose the latter career alternative.

Such a shift would create in every school system a division of pre-service education--admittedly another bureaucratic level, but at least, one that is closer to the operational level and not so removed as now, when it is bound up in the bureaucracies, politics, and distractions in higher education.

At the same time we might admit that most teachers are not career teachers, and legitimize and utilize this fact by training two levels, or kinds, of teachers. The first would be skilled craftsmen, technicians in teaching, who would develop pedagogical know-how via an apprenticeship system as teacher aide, then helping teacher, and finally, junior partner in a teaching team. The second would be career professionals, possessed of know-why as well as know-how, who would also serve as clinical teacher educators in the system's division of teacher preparation and hold consulting appointments in local colleges.

Wild as these speculations may be, they at least have the virtue of admitting that campus based and dominated teacher education has proven largely inadequate and that future teachers should be trained where the action is.

If we can get teacher education where the action is, then we can improve the preparation of teachers for the disadvantaged--and, hopefully, make a contribution to keeping the Republic free by protecting it from ignorance.

Some Suggestions for Program Planning

an address by

Dr. Dorothy McGeoch, Professor of Education
Teachers College, Columbia University, New York

There is always a temptation, when you have had a chance to spend some time at a meeting like this, to start by saying the things that you have been inspired to say because of the meetings rather than what you have been assigned; but your program planners were very clear in indicating to me the particular aspects of this problem that they wanted me to discuss. So, except for a minor diversion or two, I am going to try to do the thing I came prepared to do.

A history of the preparation of teachers for work with the disadvantaged was developed as a part of Project Aware. It cites the very first preparation for such teachers as coming in 1805 when the Free School Society of New York City attempted to educate some of the poor children who did not belong to, or were not provided for by, any religious society. If you remember your history, you may remember that they started with one small building and one teacher and twenty children. The demand was so overwhelming that they soon realized that they not only would have to provide more facilities, but they would have to prepare teachers to work with these children. Their response to the problem of teacher preparation came in the Lancaster System, which was then in use in England. In this system, a teacher taught a number of monitors and the monitors then taught the other pupils, making it possible, with an investment in the salary of one teacher, to have some kind of education provided for as many as two hundred youngsters. It was assumed that by studying the manuals which were developed and by following them very closely, any person could soon learn to become a successful teacher in a monitoral school. This was a pioneering example of a teacher-proof system of programmed instruction.

In spite of the advantages the Lancastrian System had over some previous ways of preparing teachers, it proved to be less than perfect. So has each system, program, strategy, and technique that has been developed since then. This inadequacy was never more recognized than at present, particularly in our attempt to prepare teachers to work in depressed areas with disadvantaged youngsters.

In his chapter in The Inner-City Classroom, Harry Passow says, "Clearly teacher education, both at the preservice and inservice levels, needs modification if we are to recruit, train and keep dedicated teachers who have the know-how, insight, and commitment to extend educational opportunities to disadvantaged children." And then he goes on to say, "No radical innovations in teacher preparation programs have emerged, although some patterns seem to be forming." Let us take a minute to look at some of these patterns.

First, we have done the thing which is always easy for college people to do. We have made modifications in college courses. In Project Aware, a nation-wide research project to determine some facts about preparation of school personnel for working with disadvantaged children and youth, it was found that, of the 122 colleges and universities which incorporated a preparation for teaching the disadvantaged into their schools, 77 (or about 60%) said that they were accomplishing this goal through courses. Courses such as urban sociology or educational sociology, anthropology or community psychology, and others have been added to give the kind of background in the behavioral sciences that we have not ordinarily provided for our classroom teachers.

Some courses have been modified to develop techniques and skills essential in teaching in depressed areas. Such courses include help with diagnostic and remedial procedures, with methods and materials for individualizing instruction, with strategies for classroom control, and with personnel and material resources. These courses have tended to be taught generally by someone who has had experience in working in depressed area schools. Often there is the "This is how I did it" kind of thing, fairly localized and likely to be quite prescriptive. These courses may be somewhat limited; but even worse are those that are being taught, unfortunately, by people who have never been in such schools at all.

I would like to give you a sample of the major topics of a course which is called "Understanding the Inner-City Child and Environment." Listen to this course outline: The Culture of the Poor; Value System; Self-image; Psychological Import of Being Poor; Ethnic Groups, their opportunities and lack of opportunities; Contributions of Various Ethnic Groups, Music, etc,; the Negro and the "Compressed" Life: Early sexual experiences, early marriage, early maximum salaries, general short-time outlook, matriarchal home, definition of the father, lack of purpose, job prospect, salaries, etc.; Attitudes toward Welfare; Attitude toward Authority; Services from Special Personnel and Agencies; Positive and Negative Aspects of the Poor. I don't have any idea what type of course that was, but I can see wonderful opportunities for perpetuation of stereotypes that might or might not have any relation to the kind of help a student would need working with children in depressed areas.

I think there is one somewhat indirect influence on course, which results from the increase in direct experience and from adding other background courses. This may be a good influence in disguise because curriculum methods courses in many places had to be combined or integrated, related to clinical experience, or given the situational approach simply because the program would not stretch far enough to have the usual number of individual methods courses. Many of the preservice college and university programs have these characteristic types of course modifications. A re-arrangement, if you will, but obviously not a major adaptation.

There is a second group of modifications which are much more extensive and much more varied. There are the provisions for a variety of clinical experiences intended to provide first-hand contact for preservice and in-service teachers of the disadvantaged. These experiences are generally expected to give knowledge about the tasks involved and to develop positive attitudes. Again I would like to look at some different kinds of clinical experiences that have been made a part of some of our programs for preparing teachers for the disadvantaged. The experiences in out-of-school agencies range all the way from a few superficial visits to slum areas and bringing in resource speakers; to working as volunteers one hour a week or tutoring a child, working in poverty programs or Civil Rights projects or serving in community centers as group leaders or in homework helper programs. These experiences with out-of-school agencies are intended to give the becoming teacher some idea of what the culture is like and what the children are like.

Within the school there are experiences as part-time teaching assistants or as tutors. The tutor may have had some professional training through course work in teaching of reading for example, or be completely unskilled, equipped with only a desire to help and an interest in children. Students often serve as teacher assistants or tutors to gain experience prior to their student teaching. The Urban Education Program at Syracuse University illustrates the use of such experiences. During the first, or orientation, summer session, students are placed immediately in classroom situations and in the summer demonstration school, which is organized and operated by the Syracuse program. The demonstration school is housed in the Croton Elementary School, a neighborhood school that is located in and serves the predominately Negro slum area of the city of Syracuse. The program students spend each morning during their first summer in an assigned classroom, under the guidance of selected experienced teachers who compose the demonstration school faculty. Here the students observe and directly experience the kinds of pupils and instructional problems that they will encounter as interns in their classrooms during the school year that follows. The summer experience helps the student to become familiar with "what is" in terms of curriculum, methods and rules and regulations of the city schools.

Also there are internships with or without previous student teaching experience. In Florida, where student teaching is called internship, these experiences are accompanied by some payment for work in the school. The interns have a greater responsibility than the typical student teacher. In the Central Michigan situation there are three steps in the kinds of prior experience. In the junior year, the student goes out as a teacher assistant and is paid 50% of the salary of a regular teacher in the school system. At the senior year, he becomes an extern, a role roughly similar to a student teacher's, and is paid 65% of the beginning salary. At the fifth year, he becomes an intern and/or teacher associate and is paid 80% of a regular salary. Many of you are also familiar with Harry Rivlin's plan at Fordham, which includes three levels of direct experiences, with increasing responsibilities and increasing pay. Especially when combined with seminars and coordinate course work, these programs of direct experiences represent real attempts to bring preparation nearer to reality for new teachers of the disadvantaged.

The third big class of modifications have been changes in program organization and structure. Here I can mention only two or three. You can add more from your own experience and your own reading. First there are the seminars which bring together clinical experiences and knowledge components to promote analysis of teaching and planning for programs. Most seminars provide for a flexible organization, but not all have succeeded because it takes tremendous skill and ability to make the seminars serve the purpose of program unification and the promotion of inquiry.

Also I might note the use of institutes, workshops, and other special in-service programs. In the summer of 1965 there were 61 N.D.E.A. institutes and ten teacher-education programs financed by OEO. These institutes and workshops were generally planned to promote understanding of the life conditions of the disadvantaged and to develop the necessary instructional skills, techniques and materials. When it came time to evaluate the programs it was found that each accomplished a lot more of the former than the latter. The participants were able to record a lot of experiences which helped influence attitudes. Yet, when it came right down to "How do you actually teach children who have this kind of background? What adaptation needs to be made in the techniques of teaching? In skills and in materials?"--they found what we have previously stated. We just don't know much about teaching disadvantaged children.

The third type of modification I have listed is increased school-college cooperation in planning and supervising programs for preparing teachers for disadvantaged children. I think we have to agree that the present programs of cooperation mean that the schools are expected to cool while the colleges and universities operate. For example, working with a group of parents the other day in composing a statement, I used the term "cooperation." They rejected it completely. They said, "That's a weasel word; it doesn't mean anything. You can say cooperation and mean that one person goes ahead since the others are expected to agree." When we said "meaningful participation," however, we had a concept that was meaningful to the group.

At Wayne University the school, college and community council in the teacher education center does have real if limited power. In St. Cloud, North Dakota, the school and the college council jointly administer funds paid by the college for student teaching. In New York, a school-community-university council has been operating and making decisions for some months now. I have sat through several sessions and I must admit that for the first few weeks all we did was to let everyone know what suspicions we had of one another. The university people were told that they really sat up on a hill and did not know what was going on. When it was proposed that a course in teaching reading be instituted for the staff of the high school, to help them make reading a part of each of the high school courses in this very deprived community, we were told that no university professor could handle such a course. But we sat and listened to one another Tuesday night, after Tuesday night, after Tuesday night, and things began to happen. The council consists of three representatives from the staff of the school; a representative of the departmental chairman; two union representatives; representatives from the community, the parents, Teachers College and of the administration of the school. The night that I will always remember was when one of the student members was chairman of the group. The group was getting pretty excited and two or three of the community ladies were outshouting everybody else. At one point in the discussion Albert, the student chairman, stood up, pounded on the table and said, "Ladies, you are disrespectful to each other. Will you please sit down so that I can call on the people one at a time." They sat down.

People are now talking to one another. They are beginning to be able to work with each one having a vote and using it. They are recognizing that they have the power, and therefore they are willing to accept to a limited extent, professional judgment. I know that the present picture isn't bright. But neither do I think is their answer that the school system take over completely the program of teacher preparation. I can remember, if many of you can't, the Municipal Training School for Teachers which was staffed by system employees who trained teachers minutely and specially for that system. This was hardly the ideal way to produce creative and innovative teachers, and we still have some of these teachers around. This kind of control of teacher education might have great value as an education for our college teachers who would presumably be employed by the school system. I doubt however, that this would quite offset the dangers in preparing teachers for a specific situation under the present conditions. There seems to be little sense to me in going from one unsatisfactory situation--controlled by institutions of higher education--to another equally or almost as unsatisfactory by public education. I for one would rather put my effort into the long, difficult, and frustrating tasks of devising ways to work together--and I mean really working together. I am a professor of education. I happen to be rather proud of that title. It is perhaps a perverse kind of proudness, but I have another title (of which I am also proud). When I go across the street to the Community Center I am greeted by the parents there as Mrs. McGeoch. This is something that I have earned by being there a lot. They know that I don't have any children. But they have learned that I am concerned about other people's children. So they have awarded me the title, not as somebody from up there on the hill, but as Mrs. McGeoch. You see, the day that I begin to feel that my colleagues in the schools must have the title of professor in order to be accorded the status that they deserve, or when calling a person "professor" seems the only way to make visible the unique contributions of the classroom teacher, the supervisor, the administrator, the parent, the community member, then maybe I'll have to give up. I will have to give up what for me has been a life-long commitment to meaningful participation of schools and colleges in preparing teachers. Then I will be ready to agree with Hobert Burns in saying that the school might as well take over, because they could not do worse than the colleges have done.

A fourth kind of special program that has grown up is concerned in the preparing of teachers to work with auxiliary personnel. It is a much neglected area. There are instructional aides, teacher aides, teacher assistants, volunteer aides, people-oriented and task-oriented aides, poverty program or school system aides. The preliminary report of the Study of Auxiliary School Personnel and their roles and training in instruction gives information on some of the demonstration projects that took place during the summer of 1966. There will undoubtedly be many more.

There are other organizations and innovations which I am not going to report because they have so far resulted in very little additional information. Is the addition of a course in urban sociology or of a seminar dealing with problems in depressed areas an effective modification of program content for the preparation of teachers for the disadvantaged? Should prospective teachers be enrolled in courses in teaching mathematics to the disadvantaged or do the usual method courses apply? What is the relation between preservice and inservice preparation of teachers for this especially demanding assignment? Will valid evidence support the contention that an extended period of internship and gradual induction is needed? All of these questions suggest the extent of the gap that exists between what needs to be known about the preparation of teachers for the disadvantaged and what is now known and used as the basis for action. And here is where I would like to come directly to what was suggested in the topic suggested for this afternoon.

There are things that we have to know in order to make decisions about programs. Suppose we hypothesize for a start that a teacher should understand in some depth the environmental and cultural influences to which the pupil is exposed. We hear this all the time. It is nothing new. But can we plan a program to test the hypothesis? We can plan courses or seminars in urban sociology, in anthropology, in psychology, or in the understanding of minority groups. We can try to provide for a residence in the slum community as a volunteer community worker or we can arrange contacts with welfare case workers, social workers, and community service organizations. We can plan for what we think the teacher needs to know.

Yet when the experience has been completed what do we really know? Is the young student able to relate to persons of different backgrounds? Is he open to new experiences? Does he value more highly the dignity of all human beings? Are all of these things true, or have we simply deepened the prejudices already there, making the student all the more sure that there must be differences in people that separate them? Do we know much about what can really happen? Do we know anything about what the student can do as a teacher after he has had these kinds of experiences? Do they show us that the student can organize a classroom or that he can work with bureaucratic structure or accept the responsibility for planning and carrying through learning activities for thirty-five youngsters?

No, we don't know these things; nor do we know how the experiences will influence the student's ability to function in the role of a teacher. Maybe the knowledge of some of the environmental limitations of his pupils will make him less likely to expect learning achievement from them. It may communicate the "self-perpetuating prophesy" that Kenneth Clark talks about, suggesting the children don't learn because the teacher thinks that they are not able to do so. Surely, we don't know very much about what the prospective teacher is going to be able to do.

Again we might hypothesize that if a teacher understands the role of the school in our present-day society, he will be able to perform better as a teacher in that school. Surely, there is knowledge we can give. We can teach philosophical and sociological foundations of education, talking about the purpose of the schools and the relation of the school to the community and to the parent's participation. To make it more meaningful we can build in some direct experiences. Let me give you an example. Many of you know that Teachers College is located just at the edge of Harlem. In former years I have usually taken a group of student teachers from our nearest public school to my apartment in a cooperative housing project erected right in the midst of low-cost housing in a calculated attempt to build an integrated community. Up on the fourteenth floor we have looked out over the school and the surrounding buildings, talking about low-cost housing, tenements and sociological aspects of the community. It was all very lovely, sitting up there drinking coffee, looking out over the community.

This year, I took twelve student teachers to the community center to talk with a group of parents. These parents instructed the teachers on how to treat their children. In this lesson there was a tremendous amount of sincereity and real elegance of speech. But there was also a bitterness and a lack of trust in the middle class teacher and what she was likely to do to the Harlem youngster. Over and over again those parents were saying, "We want you to treat them just like other kids. Some of them are bad and you need to discipline them; some of them need to be brought out. They can do very good things and you need to give them a chance to do what they can do. What we want is that you treat them just like the other kids."

This was pretty strong medicine for students just beginning teaching. The student teachers felt that it had been a very good experience for them, but we talked a long time about what the parents' comments had meant for teachers' behavior.

We also went to parent-teacher meetings where we heard the parents expressing their conviction that a white teacher could not possibly be unbiased toward a Negro or Puerto Rican child in the classroom. One parent said, "Well, in my son's classroom a white child makes a mistake and the teacher makes him say it over again until he says it right. But when a Negro child makes a mistake he just says it once and then she goes on to someone else." Others agreed that she was right.

Recently many of them have been meeting with parents who are organizing a boycott of the school out of extreme frustration because authorities of the city are completely unwilling to listen. As teachers, we tried hard to understand what this community wanted of its schools and its teachers, what it conceived to be meaningful participation, what was meant when parents said that the teachers and the principals should be accountable to the parents. We tried to talk it all out. Now I am asking myself: What will this attempt in promoting understanding of the really terrible complexities of the role of the school and its teachers in modern urban community do to beginning teachers?

I know that there are several beginning teachers who no longer want to participate; and I suspect that if the boycott comes through, they will flee to the suburbs. There will be some of them that will go into the schools just as they have gone before, whether there are any children there or not, because they can't make up their minds where they do stand. There will be others who, at the risk of considerable difficulty to themselves and considerable disapproval on the part of some of the authorities will actually agree to teach in the "liberation school," if we have to have it. But I am asking myself again "What is it going to do for them? How is it going to influence?

There are other unknown factors. Even those who are more stable in dealing with the problems of the teacher's role; even the group that goes every night to work with the parents, will not necessarily be able to teach well in the slum school. There are certain teaching strategies and techniques which a teacher must be able to use effectively in the classroom. The teachers will have to be able to organize the classroom; they will have to be able not only to understand the teacher's role, but to perform in the teacher's role. Here is where we don't know much about how to help them. We have a tremendous number of new methods and tools to help us in teaching strategies. We have various systems for analyzing teaching and providing conceptual models for analysis and remediation. We have video-tape recordings, simulations, and micro-teaching. All of these help students to acquire certain skills; they provide opportunities for analysis and feedback.

The revolution that has come about in our ability to know what goes on in teaching is only the beginning. But it is a tremendous advance over what we knew before. With role-playing in a micro-teaching situation, any desired strategy, any way of working, can be programed and learned. The techniques for analysis promote mastery. The laboratory with role-programed students is a lot less complex than the tutoring or small group situation. The small group situation is simpler than teaching a whole class as a student teacher--which is imperfectly related to the final complexity. Like you, I have known students who were unable to resolve the complex relationships involved in thirty-five individuals, a projected learning situation, and the appropriate strategies for bringing them together in an organized classroom. In spite of the fact that these students are very sensitive to the community and its children, and have a pretty good understanding of the role of the teacher and the school, unless they have learned teaching techniques and strategies in working in the classroom, they are not going to succeed.

Our task then, as program planners, is to prepare the teacher to use the learning strategies effectively and appropriately. We need another situation, beyond traditional student teaching, in which the beginning teacher can learn the complex skills, arts, and attitudes of teaching. In order to provide the continued support and reinforcement needed to make it possible for the beginning teacher to survive while continuing to learn, to avoid adjusting too rigidly to teaching patterns which seem to work for him, to master some of the "whys" as well as the "hows," we need a program that provides for continued study and growth. We need to develop a program that will provide for continued study and growth during the beginning years of teaching. It is too easy to fail during the first year in a school in the disadvantaged area. Classes may be very large; supervision may have very little vision but a lot of prescription; opportunities for professional discussion or standard-setting with other teachers may be almost non-existent. I have said a number of times that I don't worry quite so much about the beginning teachers who give up during the first six to eight weeks of school as I do about those who psychologically withdraw, who stay on and go to school every morning, living through it only to forget about it as soon as they can get out; who stay on, not being teachers at all, but simply holding down a job. Those are the people who are going to do the real harm. They have lost all vision, all idea of what teaching can really be about. For them, each day becomes only a getting-through from nine to three, without having the kind of commotion that would bring the assistant principal down the hall to investigate and deliver a rebuke.

We need some way to modify the task of the beginning teacher and give him continued supportive contact with someone who can help him survive from day-to-day without completely losing his vision. Continuing support is needed for the student to grow as a teacher during the first several years. I believe that such support could make more difference in the quality of teachers than any other one thing that I can imagine.

Yet even this is not enough. We are finding that the beginning teacher has to understand not only his job and his children and the community, but also himself--his reactions, frustrations, and perceived failures. The teacher who is to help the child develop ego-strength needs awareness of his own person. What is he like? How can he develop self-knowledge? How can he understand the influence of his behavior on his pupils--and assume responsibility for the nature of the interaction?

Teacher education for school personnel working with the disadvantaged needs to provide the opportunity for teachers to explore their attitudes and their beliefs in small group settings, in T group sessions, or in professional individual counseling. Sheila Schwartz, writing in the February Teachers College Record, documents in a really terrifying way the need for teachers to understand the effects of their behavior. She cites a series of incidents as evidence that "teachers who cannot get ego gratification from student accomplishment learn to get it from student failure, and therefore resort to strategies designed to perpetuate failure." Can a teacher education program develop the kind of person who respects the dignity and integrity of every human being and demonstrates this respect, while demanding as a teacher the best the student can offer?

There are those who say that basic attitudes are formed long before the college age, and that attempts to change them are pretty futile. What little evidence we have seems to give support to this view.

But do we know? Have we ever honestly tried to influence significantly teachers' attitudes--to assess the actual results of attitudinally influenced behavior? Have we ever really seriously faced the implications of our lack of knowledge? So this is my message and my plea--as we plan programs for teachers of the disadvantaged--let's try to avoid the pattern we have been following for years--assembling a lot of good courses, good experiences, good techniques into a well-organized, tightly packed four- or five-year package and then saying "Okay, here it is; you go through this, and somehow, the day you get your degree, you'll be a fully prepared teacher."

We need courses and experiences and programs, of course. But we need to try to determine what each of our approved practices can be expected to do in terms of desired behavior--and to build in ways of finding out whether or not it does what it is supposed to do. We need to be willing to modify or discontinue the program component if it seems not to be having the results which it is planned to achieve. We need also to be aware that a carefully planned and evaluated program will reveal at every stage of the way that some student teachers should not teach in depressed area schools; that they are not open to the kind of modification of attitudes and behavior which will enable them to grow and contribute in a slum school, or maybe any kind of school. And when we have this information we had better act on it, and not let a lot of soft-headed considerations such as sympathy for a student who must be re-directed, or concern for the shortage of teachers, keep us from the indicated action.

We'll also find some students for whom some program components are not necessary, or desirable. The principles of individual differences, of respect for unique persons, will dictate that programs will differ and will reveal the flexibility of planning that is necessary, as we try to plan a program for this student, not fit him into a preconceived mold.

Here then are the two sides. While we look at the student as he interacts with the program, we must also look at the program as it confronts the students. A thorough-going attempt to plan and evaluate program elements while providing for the flexibility needed for the beginning teacher as an individual should result in teacher education which, though still not all that we'd like it to be, is vastly better than any we have achieved so far.

Final General Session

Summary of Group Discussion Reports
Presentations by Group Chairmen

Dove: Develop an understanding of the different tasks involved in teaching, and identify the differences in requirements for teaching at various grade or assignment levels.

Increase training, in depth, in inter-personal relationships.

Continue to emphasize specialization in a particular discipline.

Establish a direct and continuing relationship with a variety of community action situations in order to provide a practical base of experience for teachers-in-training.

Grant: Teaching is a human relations activity and requires sensitivity training; for example--training designed to provide self- and social-analysis using these procedures:

1. Provide small group sessions in an unthreatening environment where one could examine his own values and prejudices and the values and prejudices of others.

2. Provide sensitivity training experiences early in pre-service education, and continue such experiences into the in-service education of teachers, possibly by providing teachers themselves with a professional counselor.

Teacher training is necessarily a collaborative effort between colleges and public schools.

Each professional-level teacher should be a curriculum development specialist, with sub-professionals trained to fill less comprehensive assignments.

Perrodin: Determine the knowledge and skills which teachers should have.

The present state of the art of teacher training indicates that neither the teacher education institution nor the public schools alone is adequate to accomplish the job; a third organization may be necessary to serve as a coordinator of teacher training.

Newman: Develop standard English as a second language of culturally disadvantaged groups or, in the meantime, make overt efforts toward understanding the habits, customs, and dialects of the culturally disadvantaged.

Howard: Teachers need certain skills and competences, varying in intensity and depth according to the demands of particular situations.

More attention should be given to initial experiences faced by new teachers.

Practical experience involving teaching responsibilities, progressing from observation to teacher aid work, program preparation, and individual student tutoring should be provided.

Expanded opportunities for earning income should be provided for needy college students aspiring to become teachers.

Perkins: Teaching involves various levels of development:

1. Awareness stage
2. Sensitivity stage
3. Technician stage
4. Transition stage
5. Teaching stage

Lee: Teacher training for all prospective teachers should begin after four years of good general education; then induction into teaching should be school-based. The teacher's first assignment should provide for extensive in-service training and materials development.

Certain teachers, aspiring to higher professional status, should return for additional training in college following career development in the public schools.

Denton: Education for teaching the disadvantaged is a continuing process.

Teachers should initiate and control in-service training programs. This calls for a new relationship between schools, colleges, state education departments, and professional organization.

Martin: Answer the question as to whether there is a need for a new kind of training or greater depth in particular areas of training for those who are to work with the disadvantaged.

Define the characteristics of teachers who can work well with the disadvantaged.

Begin planning now for the next generation of teachers so as not to be continually involved in emergency measures.

Make a deliberate effort to relate theory to practice.

Provide more actual experiences with children in action prior to taking foundation courses, thus making them more meaningful by developing sensitivity to their content.

Weaver: The sophistry that education for the poor can be accomplished in a good general education system is in error because it tends to over-generalize and to neglect the crucial differences between the poor and others.

Mobility of the Negro into middle class society is difficult, and color is the key factor.

Negro colleges, by nature, deal with compensatory education; they are thus in a position of advantage in working with the disadvantaged; they are dominated by Negroes, and have long had integrated staffs, and have a truer perspective of the problems of the poor.

Dove: Reports have emphasized the humanities, but several important questions remain unanswered:

1. Do we need a new or revised program?
2. Can a program for the disadvantaged teacher be constructed?
3. How do we evaluate the success of training programs?

Weaver: The question of different levels of teachers needs further exploration: do we continue to turn out all teachers of one type, or do we begin to develop technologists and master teachers and specialists for working with the disadvantaged?

Grant:	Additional college--school collaborative effort might involve on-the-job training for teachers throughout their college careers, with the senior year devoted entirely to internship.
Perkins:	A study must be made of the various ways of entering the teaching profession.
Perrodin:	Activities of other organizations should be investigated--for example, the National Student Association has 200,000 students involved in tutoring programs.
Newman:	A positive attitude should be developed toward every individual through gaining an understanding of the individual and his position in his culture.
Howard:	Sensitivity training is not a separate subject, but should be included in all of the curriculum along with the development of problem-solving skills.
Dove:	Inflexibility in certification standards should be changed, including flexibility in the length of time it takes particular individuals to become certified and the number of courses which they must take.
Ladd:	It seems imperative that this group be kept in contact with each other and that the benefits of this conference be sustained. A committee should be formed to structure the means of sustaining this activity.

GROUP ONE REPORT

SUGGESTIONS FOR TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

1. Knowing one's self through appropriate diagnostic procedures which would be available throughout the program. Early identification and continuous counseling and guidance at all levels of development would be fundamental. Opportunity should be provided to become familiar with exemplary characteristics of effective teaching.

2. Provision for substantive knowledge through liberal arts specialization, special emphasis on the humanities, also inclusion of the behavioral sciences and professional foundations.

3. Provision for direct experiences of the trainees to observe and to be exposed to various types of problems and situations in the school, the family and the community as determinants of his ability to relate. These experiences should be related to and supported by the available underlying theories.

4. Placement of trainees in full control of the classroom under the guidance of a master teacher.

5. Seminars conducted cooperatively by the master teacher and the college supervisor.

6. Required time for the completion of the program and certification would not be fixed, but rather depend on the type of performance and the desired level of professional development.

7. The responsibilities for the program should be a cooperative effort, involving the school as a total organization, the college or university and the community agencies.

8. The college and the school would assume joint roles in decision-making supervision, seminars and the initiative for providing direct experiences outside the school for the trainees. The colleges and schools should be responsible jointly for the continuous identification and selection of trainees, for making provision for continuous counseling and guidance, for instruction in the liberal arts, in specialized areas and in the foundations of teaching.

9. Evaluation of trainees should be continued jointly by the college and by the school as long as a need for it is indicated.

10. Suitable assignment of trainees to schools should be based on a cooperative arrangement between the school and the college.

11. There should be some means devised to evaluate the success of trainees prepared through the program design in effecting change in the behavior of pupils.

12. Evaluation of the trainees should be made prior to and at the completion of the program and requirements for certification.

Participants:

1. Dr. Pearlie Dove, Chairman
2. Miss Evelyn Carroll, Recorder
3. Jarvis Barnes
4. A. A. Branch
5. J. M. Broadus
6. Enola Byrd
7. Nicholas Castricone
8. Charles T. Lester
9. John Griffin
10. Gaither McConnell
11. Paul W. Sprayberry
12. Nelle Thompson

GROUP TWO REPORT

SUGGESTIONS FOR TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

1. Sensitivity training (T-Group) should be part of the training program for teachers preparing to work with disadvantaged children. The aim of such training would be to provide the potential teacher with the opportunity to work out anxieties to understand frustrations, to gain support in facing their problems, to develop sensitivity to the problems, to recognize the problems. The training situation should be very non-threatening. One in which the individual feels free to talk about anything. It should begin as soon as the teacher trainee begins thinking about teaching disadvantaged children. The aim of such a program would be to train teachers to look at themselves.

2. Teachers who will work with disadvantaged children should be trained to be curriculum development specialists. They should have the ability to design their own materials that are suitable for the children they will teach. With a few exceptions, the materials that currently are available to teachers are not appropriate for disadvantaged children. To be successful, teachers must have the initiative and the ability to create, to modify, to change. They need to be independent of the lock step sequence that is built into most existing textbooks.

3. Teachers need much firsthand experience with disadvantaged children while they are engaged in the study of teaching. A work-study program being instituted at the University of Georgia with the Atlanta Public Schools is an example that provides this experience. The program will admit 60 college freshmen beginning next year. These students will spend one quarter for their first three years of college as a teacher aide in the school system. They will be paid for their services. In late afternoons or evenings, they will be enrolled in their education courses. During their senior year, they will be employed full time as an assistant teacher by the school system, again studying some of their education courses at the same time. This program will provide the students with the equivalent of two full years of experience working with disadvantaged children at the same time they are engaged in their education courses.

4. New insights from psychology, sociology and anthropoloty need to be transmitted into the training program of teachers. An understanding of various sub-cultures in the United States and how cultural differences manifest themselves in the social dynamics of the classroom is needed.

Participants:

1. Anna Grant, Chairman
2. Dora Helen Skypek, Recorder
3. H. A. Bowen
4. Huey E. Charlton
5. Mildred Ellisor
6. Curtis Henson
7. Carson Lee
8. Joseph McKelpin
9. Robert Mahar
10. Virginia Rudbeck
11. Cecil Thornton
12. Maudecca Wilson

GROUP THREE REPORT

SUGGESTIONS FOR TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

1. Teacher Education apprenticeship should begin when the student first commits himself to teaching. Formal apprenticeship should begin with the student performing the services of a teacher aide or a community service aide.

2. The senior year should include prolonged experiences in public schools gradually taking increased responsibilities of a professional teacher.

3. Pre-service experiences should include teaching in the inner-city, studying the community extensively and developing case studies of individuals. Student teachers should have an exposure to a wide variety of school situations, such as non-graded classes, communication skills laboratories and others.

4. Cooperation of various organizations should be the theme of in-service education. In-service education is the responsibility of the Board of Regents, State Department of Education, local school systems and universities.

5. In-service education should be carried on by the initiative of local school teachers, perhaps through the local teachers organization or professional association. The school administration's role would be to provide for release time, provide staff teacher materials, resources, consultant services. The university should provide consultant services when requested. With the in-service education function originating with the local school system, the State Department could drop its renewal certification requirements. In-service education could then more usefully reflect the particular requirements and needs of the local situation.

Participants:

1. George Griffin, Chairman
2. William H. Denton, Recorder
3. Helen Branch
4. Milly Cowles
5. Clifford England
6. Hulon Farmer
7. Hugh Fordyce
8. Harry O. Hall
9. Gwendolyn Newkirk
10. Joanne Nurss
11. Bernard Threatte
12. Alex Wawrzyniak

GROUP FOUR REPORT

SUGGESTIONS FOR TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

1. The program needs to develop in the teacher positive attitudes towards her own professional competencies and towards every child's ability to learn.

2. The program needs to develop in the teacher a positive self-concept, self-confidence, self-understanding.

3. The program should provide laboratory experience early in the training program to help prevent culture shock. The practice of working with students should go hand-in-hand with the study of education. Students should gain experiences in a wide variety of schools with a variety of children.

4. The program should have such features that would make working with disadvantaged children attractive to potential teachers. The program should provide an opportunity for the teacher trainee to understand, accept and appreciate the variety of sub-cultures in the United States. The program should provide the teacher with the skills necessary to compensate for those cultural characteristics of the child that are barriers to academic achievement. For example, the teacher should be able to handle the language problem brought to school by children who speak an English dialect.

5. The program should provide the teacher with the skill to develop her own materials and techniques appropriate to the students with whom she will be working.

Participants:

1. Rhoda S. Newman, Chairman
2. Harvey Davis, Recorder
3. Gail Burbridge
4. Virginia Frank
5. Thomas L. Harris
6. Lorella McKinney
7. Alexander Moore
8. Violet Richards
9. Luther R. Rogers
10. Fred Schab
11. Paul Todd
12. Clara West

GROUP FIVE REPORT

SUGGESTIONS FOR TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

1. Knowledge of human behavior as it relates to cultural differences, communities, experience in working with youngsters.--(Home background)
2. Understanding and sincere desire to work with disadvantaged youth
3. Coping with the frustrations of the job
4. Develop a sense of responsibility for teaching the disadvantaged child
5. Appropriate role expectations
6. Development of the abilities to observe behavior--(Anthropology, Sociology, Psychology)
7. Ability to work out a flexible curriculum
8. Ability to articulate ideas and to defend positions
9. Self-analysis--Self-knowledge
10. Human relation skills
11. Ability to be "wrong" and to make mistakes--ability to live with ambiguity
12. Sensitivity to the needs and problems of others
13. Research skills
14. The "stuff" of the curriculum
15. Selection of texts and other appropriate materials--knowledge of available material
16. Different modes of learning and how to capitalize on these differences
17. Skill in handling discipline problems
18. Knowledge of the nature of poverty
19. Integration of knowledge with experience

20. Knowledge of working with emotionally disturbed children

21. Teaching skills

22. Diagnostic and corrective skills

23. Problem solving--Emphasis

24. Guidance of youngsters

25. Ethics of teaching

Participants:

1. Edward T. Ladd, Chairman
2. James Howard, Recorder
3. Donald Agnew
4. Lilla Carlton
5. Rosa Chapman
6. Cornelia Eldredge
7. Sister Mary Francois
8. Robert Garren
9. Robert Griffin
10. Don Hill
11. James H. Hinson, Jr.
12. Paul Mortenson

GROUP SIX REPORT

SUGGESTIONS FOR TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

General assumptions on teacher education:

1. The present plan is inadequate and ineffective.
2. More than four years is needed.
3. Some believe that all prospective teachers should begin their professional training after completing the B.A. degree.
4. A critical look at the content, place, and sequence of Education courses in relation to student readiness and experience should be made.
5. Any revision or development of new plans should include the State Department of Education and the Certification Division.

Plans suggested by group members but not necessarily endorsed by the total group include:

1. Four years of good general education. After four years, go into the schools for direct contact and training planned on the basis of individual need. Time for planning and time for working with the principal, counselor, and other staff members would be provided. A residential unit for middle grade students for possibly one quarter with adequate supporting staff might be provided as supplementary training. It is assumed that follow-up college training would be necessary but time prevented clarification or definition.
2. Earlier contact with children in school within the present four-year program, possible beginning at the sophomore year, and providing for student teaching earlier than the last quarter of the senior year.
3. The question was raised regarding the necessity for a uniform four-year program for all teachers vs a different program for elementary and secondary teachers.

Participants:

1. Emmett Lee, Chairman
2. Lucile Sessions, Recorder
3. Harold Arnold
4. Inez D. Dolvin
5. Donald Ross Green
6. Father William Hoffman
7. James Kelly
8. Edmund Martin
9. Tommie Samkange
10. William Gene Watson
11. Sharon Williams

GROUP SEVEN REPORT

SUGGESTIONS FOR TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

1. Provide long term internship experiences with disadvantaged children. Increase the attractiveness of working with disadvantaged children by employing students as teacher aides and as assistant teachers.

2. Leadership training programs are needed for administrators and specialists who will be responsible for the programs in inner-city schools. These programs should focus heavily on understandings of the culture of the city. The program should heavily emphasize the skills and procedures that are needed for a person whose job is to manage the varied process of school improvement. Techniques of continuous school improvement should be emphasized.

3. Pre-service and in-service education programs will benefit from extensive change programs and from joint appointments. Colleges should loan faculty members to public schools; public schools should loan staff members to the colleges.

4. Both pre-service and in-service programs need to integrate theory and practice. Study in the foundation of education should be offered at the same time the student is gaining experience in working with children.

5. The teacher education program should be based heavily on learning from a variety of teacher models. The school system and universities must work together on the various alternative teaching models.

6. A variety of community experiences should be a major feature of the undergraduate education program. Emphasis should be placed on having direct relationship with both children and adults in settings outside of the public school. The setting may be churches, community centers. The college students could be responsible for organizing their own programs in the community.

Participants:

1. John S. Martin, Chairman
2. Bruce Rosen, Recorder
3. D. L. Boger
4. Eleanor Harrison
5. William Jackson
6. Richard Lawrence
7. Sister Mary Malachy
8. Clyde O. McDaniel, Jr.
9. Kenneth McKay
10. Ralph Schmid
11. Wayne Teague

GROUP EIGHT REPORT

SUGGESTIONS FOR TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

1. Awareness stage--to become aware of the culture of children who will be taught.

   Through experiences such as visits to homes, schools, head start programs, with public health nurse, etc., through films, use of video tape, conferences with teachers, parents, principals, participating with community activities, tutoring, small group activity, etc. This stage would begin very early in college and continue throughout entire program.

2. Sensitivity stage--sensitiveness to feelings, values, and behavior patterns of children to be taught. A teacher needs to become sensitive to the child's self-concept, his concept of his place in society and society's relation to him. Observation, etc., as listed above could be continued.

3. Technician stage--a period where the student teacher (or future teacher) will learn methods and materials, develop creative ideas or approaches to teaching, develop an understanding of ways of working with children.

   During this stage it might be advisable for the college to have the opportunity to work closely with one or two nearby schools so that students could have frequent opportunities to practice techniques learned in education courses.

4. Practitioner stage--beginning as observer and gradually moving through the period of teacher aide, teacher assistant, student teacher, and beginning teacher. This would also extend beyond graduation. There is a need for supervision, consultant service, etc., throughout first year of teaching.

   Supervision should be the joint responsibility of public school and college personnel. Perhaps both school systems and colleges should designate specific people to work with beginning teachers throughout the first year.

5. In-service

   (a) School systems need to release teachers for seminars and further training and discussion. Sensitivity programs should be continued through these seminars.

   (b) More opportunity for teachers to keep up with pertinent research and how to use the results of the research.

   (c) College personnel should be available to work with school personnel in working closely to help first-year teachers.

6. General principles for improving the teacher education program.

   (a) College programs should be individualized according to the student's background, abilities, etc.

   (b) Whenever possible, liberal and professional education ought to be related to the field.

   (c) More cooperation between college programs and personnel could strengthen entire program.

Participants:

1. Mary Ellen Perkins, Chairman
2. Edithgene Sparks, Recorder
3. Louise Boswell
4. Dorothy Bunyan
5. David E. Day
6. Maenelle Dempsey
7. D. E. Gerlock
8. John Letson
9. Lionel Newsom
10. LeRoy W. Ullrich
11. Glenn Vergason

GROUP NINE REPORT

SUGGESTIONS FOR TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

1. Some basic assumptions or beliefs:
   - a. The program for the teacher of the disadvantaged should have a liberal arts education as a base.
   - b. Neither the public school nor the teacher education institution itself is adequate to prepare teachers for this particular responsibility.
   - c. All teachers do not have the aptitude to develop as successful teachers of the disadvantaged.
   - d. For a teacher to be successful in teaching the disadvantaged, special training is needed.
   - e. Programs for the teacher of the disadvantaged should encompass K-12.
   - f. The educational program for the disadvantaged child should be broader than preparation for a vocation.
   - g. The term "disadvantaged" is interpreted to refer to a socio-economic level rather than any ethnic group.
2. Some recommendations:
   - a. A third organization be considered as a coordinator of the services of the schools of education and the public schools.
   - b. The team approach be utilized in order to provide more adequate experiences.
   - c. Programs should include theory, a variety of field experiences over an extended period of time (at pre-service and in-service levels) along with teacher participating evaluation.
   - d. The program must emphasize involvement in the community of the disadvantaged child.
   - e. Successful teachers of the disadvantaged should be encouraged to continue in the classroom (Some type of reward be provided such as smaller classes, team leadership, etc.).

Participants:

1. Alex Perrodin, Chairman
2. Ruby Crowe, Recorder
3. Stanley Alprin
4. Polly Bartholomew
5. Lawrence E. Boyd
6. John Codwell
7. E. A. Holmes
8. Deloris Saunders
9. Rex Toothman
10. Father Daniel O'Conner
11. Kenneth Matheny

GROUP TEN REPORT

SUGGESTIONS FOR TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

1. The need for new directions. Whatever guise a TE program for training pre- and in-service teachers for teaching the disadvantaged may take, it is believed that even a first-year TE program is not enough and that present TE programs are inadequate for this group. Fundamental to new directions are, at least, three factors: (a) need to introduce a cadre of professionals who will operate as change agents--this is needed in the education of all our people, and particularly the education of people who will teach the poor; (b) the need to break down conventional academic disciplines not only because of the new possibilities for processing and integrating both the amazing amount of new information but the old information at higher levels-integration of the disciplines extends the breadth of knowledge required to solve problems; (c) the massive increments in technological competence and mastery of the power of the machine. Over-riding these are changes in the political, social, and economic relations, and especially the civil rights-human rights revolution, rise of underdeveloped nations overseas, the new forms of military weaponry which limit war as a method of resolving international conflict, and the world-wide increase of the distance between the poor and the rich.

   These, and other developments, have serious implications for redirecting teacher education--indeed, education generally.

2. The sophistry that the education of the poor can be accomplished within an educational program which is good for anyone. Our system cannot continue to attempt to produce a standard product based in middle-class norms, and to promise rewards by inducing conformity to a middle-class measuring stick. Our teachers come to the disadvantaged ill equipped to deal with poor kids. There is the tendency to over generalize and oversimplify minority-types by focusing on similarities and neglecting crucial differences. In the southern inner-city these differences are clear. Immigrant and poor white children are not similar to poverty-stricken Negro children whose whole life and recent history (past 300 years) is a background of deprivation and subordination--the theory of the melting pot or of movement into an upper-class level simply doesn't work for the Negro--his problem is different (if it wasn't, Negroes as variants would have long ago disappeared from American life)--the clearest most inescapable difference is color, prejudice, segregation and so on. There are some similarities between poor whites and Negroes, but also inescapable differences. Neither poverty among poor whites or Negroes can be dealt with within a conventional or middle class frame.

3. The goals of the teacher education institution, the prospective or in-service teacher, the children whom they teach are not the same. Our goal is to structure and operate a program for training teachers of the disadvantaged and we concern ourselves with this; the prospective teachers goal is to go in there and do something; the Negro-white poor child operates in an alien, cruel, fearful, confusing world and desires (perhaps) to be educated but doesn't think too well of the school as the place to get educated--it is a blunder to always assume that these goals are in the realm of "togetherness" although we probably will continue to try to bring them together.

4. Of tremendous, still unexploited relevance is the Negro college or University. These institutions have dealt with compensatory and deprived types from their inception. They have been integrated (from the beginning with Negro-white staff) longer than southern white-type schools and colleges, hence have a documented obvious advantage. This places them in some ways, in a possible vanguard posture for the education of the deprived. Moreover, it is useful for prospective or in-service teachers to be taught, to live, and work and learn within a frame dominated, to some extent, by Negroes. We must come to utilize these built-in advantages.

5. The goal of teacher education for teachers of the disadvantaged should not necessarily be to move the lower class into a middle class field.

6. I would push for producing at least three levels of teachers. One based in an undergraduate program oriented towards the disadvantaged but realistically knowing that some of the prospects will simply be what we now call good teachers, or fair teachers; another type would be a technician or technologist type skilled competent in subject matter, versed in innovation and the like, and a third type who would be similar to the master teacher who could guide, advise and comfort others.

   There is need of selective screening of those who teach the teachers of the disadvantaged. Once we structure and program we must be careful of who teaches teachers--they must operate in a program which has a built-in contact and identification with the poor as evidence in their continual contact with them.

Participants:

1. Edward K. Weaver, Chairman
2. William D. Osborne, Recorder
3. Richard Beard
4. Phillip Blumenthal
5. Woodrow Breland
6. Thesba Johnston
7. Father Thomas J. Madden
8. William Maloy
9. Ted R. Owens
10. Carl Renfroe
11. Prince Wilson

ATLANTA AREA WORKSHOP ON PREPARING TEACHERS TO WORK WITH DISADVANTAGED YOUTH

Summary: Individual Suggestions for Changes in the Preparation and Continuing Education of Teachers for Disadvantaged Youth

SELECTION OF TEACHER CANDIDATES

1. Personal Characteristics: curiosity, adventure, imagination, flexibility, perseverance, compassion for fellow men.
2. Educational Requirements: four years of liberal arts, not necessarily with teacher education.
3. Individual suitability for working with disadvantaged: candidate psychologically counseled in regards to accepting the disadvantaged; group therapy sessions of all candidates in attitudes toward disadvantaged.
4. Attracting candidates: sell program; make it attractive, so to attract the "best" people; recruit boys into program, so train good administrators early.

NEW FEATURES FOR PROGRAMS

1. The "inquiry approach" to problem solving.
2. The study of problems unique to the disadvantaged.
3. Learning to logically proceed from identifying aims, determining procedures, and developing tactics and materials, followed by evaluation.
4. Developing teacher understandings of the individual and his culture, producing a positive attitude toward students.
5. Lab (field) experiences as an adjunct to all professional education courses.
    (a) With children and familes before student teaching.
    (b) In summer field study in neighborhoods.
    (c) In the teacher aide position, before student teaching.

   (d) Work with community agencies (during summer--college credit given).

   (e) Through un-graded observation participation sessions before student teaching.

6. Learning procedures (through practice) of measure - evaluate - test - diagnose.

7. Urban sociology: Anthropology.

8. Team teaching practices.

9. Learning to develop methods and materials specialized for disadvantaged school.

10. Negro history.

11. Nutrition; hygiene.

12. Creating/preparing specific instructional materials (therefore, a materials laboratory is necessary).

13. Training in individualizing instruction.

14. Language communication skills; linguistics; reading, especially remedial.

15. Psychology--theories of personality, theories of learning, diagnosis of learning difficulties.

16. A study of the South--the "mind of the South," problems of culture, issues, reactions.

17. Education in the kindergarten and pre-kindergarten.

18. Adult education and the community school.

ORGANIZATION FEATURES

1. Working partnership of college and school.

2. One department and one individual to develop and assume authority in the college.

3. Non-school agencies included to know their role; how they may help both community and individuals, particular schools, and teachers.

4. Use of a group of early-exposed students and interested faculty of college and school system to decide together individual programs of study.

5. College - Public School exchange: Let classroom teachers give college seminars; put college professors in classrooms to conduct research studies.

6. Use of all resources--teachers, students, community agencies, members of disadvantaged community--in panels, round-table discussions to help plan for maximum effectiveness; "maximum involvement for maximum effectiveness."

7. In-service program: Set up teacher cadres of interested, involved teachers at all stages of professionalism to meet once a week, during school year, reporting research, identifying problems, securing consultants, growing professionally, providing social-cultural experiences among teachers, and including community.

8. New teachers: Place beginning teachers in disadvantaged areas according to their interests and preparation, not by the usual haphazard method.

    (a) Continue University support, supervision, advice--through visitations, follow-up studies, conferences, seminars, dinner meetings with college in area.

    (b) Work in teams for analyzing, group planning, support.

    (c) Establish close ties with an experienced, emphatic teacher, for apprenticeship.

    (d) Provide an aide for clerical duties so to free the beginning teachers for planning, contact with other teachers, and other grade levels.

9. Staff schools with some community people (better working relationship for teachers, kids, school, community).

10. Employ more aides, so to free the teacher more adequately.

11. Reduce class size, K - 3, to 15 per teacher in the disadvantaged school.

12. State Department: Establish a special department on Urban education (or disadvantaged children). Provide consultative, research and dissemination services to schools and universities.

13. Certification requirements relaxed to permit the inclusion of more new studies that relate to teaching disadvantaged children.

INDIVIDUAL COMMENTS ON ANONYMOUS EVALUATION FORMS

SUMMARY

I. Structure and Scheduling of Workshop

Good aspects:
- Pre-publicized roster
- Handling of accommodations
- Free afternoon
- Informality
- Atmosphere conducive to work
- Integration of work with play
- Alternation of large groups with small groups
- Adequate time to work, think, plan individually

Suggestions:
- Films, video-tapes should have been further described
- Bibliography should have been provided in advance
- More research into the needs of teachers of disadvantaged preceding the workshop

II. Participants

Good aspects:
- All there to contribute
- Good contacts to be made
- Individual stimulation
- Informality of workshop which encouraged contacts
- Good working sizes: numbers in groups; numbers involved in workshop

Suggestions:
- More teachers (for a better balance of theory with practice)
- More experienced teachers
- More principals, counselors, representatives of supportive agencies, community workers, etc.
- More specialists in content areas
- Too many from the same power structure ("It's hard for the one accused to try his own case and judge it fairly.")

III. Speakers

Good aspects:
- Well-prepared; well-coordinated with duties of discussion groups
- Stimulated and channeled activities for group sessions
- Spoke in specifics, not generalities
- "Models of commitment, conviction, capability"
- Became part of group of participants by their inclusion in small group sessions
- Teacher panel brought people down to earth

Suggestions: Teacher panel should have included some experienced teachers

IV. Small Group Work Sessions

a. Make-up of each group:

Good aspects: Sufficiently varied
Variety was stimulating

Suggestions: What if each group was homogeneous? Then the group might have been more able to reach decisions that they themselves could put into immediate practice.

Should be arranged at intervals
Consultant and teacher in each--for stability

b. Recorders and Chairmen

Suggestions: Should have been more fully prepared
Should have worked together for a day preceding workshop

c. Agenda:

Suggestions: Might have helped to have had a "dream" proposal, an ideal, either developed or given to each group to work it into the actual (the "system").

Should have been more highly structured, in case of weak chairmen, or too much "philosophizing."

More unity from sequential topics that followed the direction of the major speeches.

Objectives too hazy; each participant should have had a copy of the group discussion objectives.

An individual worksheet to keep people on the track.

d. Written summaries:

Suggestions: Interfered with progress of group toward practical ends. Better to chew over a few ideas than to develop an entire scheme.

Tape each small group session.
Have earlier feedback among groups.

V. Final Reporting Session

Suggestions: Unrealistic and entirely unnecessary.
Purpose not achieved, nor could it have been under any other circumstance.
"Important ideas simply cannot be effectively communicated in a few sentences of generalizations."
Most of audience thought session "painful."

VI. Follow-up

Suggestions: Group summaries distributed, as well as a conference report and progress reports.

Individual feedback.
Keep group posted, to keep them "committed."
Pass on workshop report to new Georgia Legislative Committee on Teacher Certification and Training; proposed revisions apply to training of all teachers.

Next year and in the future, a progress evaluation conference.

"Why not take slum school staffs on a work week-end like this one?"

VII. Location

Suggestions: Hold next conference in Vine City, so that each participant can know students, parents, teachers, etc.

Ridiculous location!
Perfect location!!

ATLANTA AREA WORKSHOP ON PREPARING TEACHERS TO WORK WITH DISADVANTAGED YOUTH

SUMMARY OF INDIVIDUAL EVALUATIONS

How Satisfied Were You With the Conference?

Very Satisfied Plus to Extremely Satisfied	30
Satisfied Plus to Very Satisfied	29
Not Very Satisfied Plus to Satisfied	9
Extremely Dissatisfied to Not very Satisfied	3
Total	71

What Did You Particularly Like About the Conference?

	Indicated First	Indicated Second
The Enthusiasm of Participants	2	1
Interaction with a Variety of Participants	10	3
The Speakers in General Sessions	24	9
The Small Group Work Sessions	6	4
The Staff Teachers	2	2
The Structure and Scheduling of Activities	11	8
The Accommodations and Free Time	3	5
The Focus or Topics of the Workshop	11	1
Environment	2	1
Total	71	44

What Did you Particularly Dislike About the Conference?

	Indicated First	Indicated Second
Nothing	36	-
No Experienced Teachers of Disadvantaged Present	9	1
No Principals Present	-	1
The Speakers in the General Sessions	5	-
The Small Group Work Sessions	5	5
The Structure and Scheduling Of Activities	5	-
Discussions were too Idealistic or Theoretical; Not Practical or Realistic	4	2
Not Enough Teachers	1	-
No Need for Non-Atlantans	-	1
Disadvantaged Not Only Negroes	1	1
Nobody Came for Square Dancing	1	-
Too many Educators; Need More Agencies and Organizations	1	-
Lengthy Introduction of Speakers	1	1
Poor Sound System for Group Meetings	2	-
Total	71	12

ATLANTA AREA WORKSHOP ON PREPARING TEACHERS TO WORK WITH DISADVANTAGED YOUTH

ORGANIZATIONS REPRESENTED

I. Colleges and Universities

a. Agnes Scott College	(1)
b. Atlanta University	(5)
c. University Center Corp.	(1)
d. Atlanta University School of Social Work	(1)
e. Clark College	(2)
f. Emory University	(10)
g. Georgia State	(6)
h. Morehouse College	(2)
i. Morris Brown College	(1)
j. Oglethorpe College	(2)
k. Spelman College	(2)
l. University of Georgia	(5)
12 Colleges and Universities	38 Participants

II. School Systems

a. Atlanta Archdiocese Schools	(4)
b. Atlanta Public Schools	(10)
c. Decatur City Schools	(2)
d. DeKalb County Schools	(1)
e. Clayton County Schools	(2)
f. Fulton County Schools	(2)
g. Gwinnett County Schools	(2)
h. Marietta Public Schools	(1)
8 School Systems	24 Participants

III. Atlanta Organizations

a. Atlanta Area Teacher Education Service	(3)
b. Anti-Defamation League	(1)
c. Georgia Education Association	(2)
d. Georgia Education Improvement Council	(1)
e. Georgia State Department of Education	(4)
f. Metropolitan School Development Council	(1)
g. Southern Association of Colleges and Schools	(3)
h. Southeastern Education Foundation	(2)
i. Southeastern Education Laboratory	(2)
j. Urban Laboratory	(7)
i. Urban League	(1)

---

11 Organizations 27 Participants

IV. Other States

E.I.P. (SACS)

Alabama	(1)
Florida	(1)
Georgia	(1)
Louisiana	(2)
North Carolina	(2)
Tennessee	(2)

Project Opportunity (SACS)

Alabama	(2)
Georgia	(1)
Kentucky	(2)
Mississippi	(1)
Virginia	(1)

S.E.L.

Alabama	(3)
Florida	(2)
Georgia	(1)

---

9 States 22 Participants

Total: 111 Participants

ATLANTA AREA WORKSHOP ON PREPARING TEACHERS TO WORK WITH DISADVANTAGED YOUTH

Callaway Gardens
Pine Mountain, Georgia

March 5-8, 1967

Roster of Participants

Agnew, Donald
Education Improvement Project
Southern Association of Colleges & Schools
795 Peachtree Street, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

Alprin, Stanley
Education Improvement Project
Fisk University
Nashville, Tennessee 37203

Arnold, Harold N.
Atlanta Urban League
239 Auburn Avenue
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Barnes, Jarvis
Atlanta Public Schools
224 Central Avenue, S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Bartholomew, Polly
National Institute for
Advanced Study in Teaching
Disadvantaged Youth
1126 Sixteenth Street
Washington, D. C. 20036

Beard, Richard L.
Project Opportunity Center
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia 22903

Blumenthal, Philip
Division of Teacher Education
Emory University
Atlanta, Georgia 30322

Boger, D. L.
Morehouse College
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

Boswell, Louise
Atlanta University
223 Chestnut Street, S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

Bowen, H. A.
Atlanta Public Schools, Area I.
1625 Mozley Drive, S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

Boyd, Lawrence E.
Atlanta University
223 Chestnut Street, S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

Branch, A. A.
Project Opportunity
Tougaloo College
Tougaloo, Mississippi 39174

Branch, Helen
Atlanta Public Schools, Title III.
2930 Forrest Hills Drive, S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30315

Breland, Woodrow W.
Georgia State College
33 Gilmer Street, S.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Broadus, J. M.
Project Opportunity
Transylvania College
201 W. Third
Lexington, Kentucky 40508

Bunyan, Dorothy
Project Opportunity
Southern Association of
Colleges & Schools
795 Peachtree Street, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

Burbridge, Gail
Atlanta Public Schools, C.S.L.
2930 Forrest Hills Drive, S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30315

Burns, Hobart W.
San Jose State College
San Jose, California 95114

Byrd, Enola
Morris Brown College
643 Hunter Street, N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

Carlton, Lilla
Georgia Education Association
(TEPS)
197 Central Avenue, S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Carroll, Evelyn J.
Spelman College
350 Leonard, S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

Castricone, Nicholas
Georgia State College
33 Gilmer Street, S.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Chapman, Rosa
Atlanta Public Schools, Title III.
2930 Forrest Hills Drive, S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30315

Charlton, Huey E.
Atlanta University
223 Chestnut Street, S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

Codwell, John
Education Improvement Project
Southern Association of Colleges
& Schools
795 Peachtree Street, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

Cody, Wilmer S.
Urban Laboratory in Education
Education Improvement Project ✓
2930 Forrest Hills Drive, S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30315

Cowles, Milly
College of Education
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602

Crowe, Ruby
Fulton County Schools
786 Cleveland Avenue, S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30315

Davis, Harvey E.
Gwinnett County Schools
Lawrenceville, Georgia

Day, David E.
Urban Laboratory in Education
Education Improvement Project
2930 Forrest Hills Drive, S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30315

Dempsey, Maenelle
State Department of Education
State Office Building
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Denton, William H.
Agnes Scott College
East College Avenue
Decatur, Georgia

Dolvin, Inez
Atlanta Area Teacher Education
Service
115 Thomson Hall
Emory University
Atlanta, Georgia 30322

Dove, Pearly
Clark College
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

Eldredge, Cornelia
College of Education
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602

Ellisor, Mildred
Education Improvement Project
Auburn University
Auburn, Alabama 36830

England, Clifford N.
Clayton County Schools
Jonesboro, Georgia 30236

Farmer, Hulon
Gwinnett County Schools
Lawrenceville, Georgia 30245

Fordyce, Hugh R.
Project Opportunity
Southern Association of
Colleges & Schools
795 Peachtree Street, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

Francois, Sister Mary
Catholic Schools of the
Atlanta Archdiocese
29 Boulevard, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30312

Frank, Virginia
Southern Education Foundation
811 Cypress Street, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

Garren, Robert
Georgia State College
33 Gilmer Street, S.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Grant, Anna H.
Morehouse College
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

Green, Donald Ross
Division of Teacher Education
Emory University
Atlanta, Georgia 30322

Griffin, George A.
Marietta Public Schools
Marietta, Georgia 30060

Griffin, Robert
DeKalb County Schools
Walker High School
1804 Bouldercrest Drive, S.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30316

Hall, Harry O.
Southeastern Education Laboratory
Miami Component
South Miami, Florida

Harris, Thomas L.
Rural Education Improvement
Project
Georgia Southern College
Statesboro, Georgia 30459

Henson, Curtis
Metropolitan School
Development Council
2930 Forrest Hills Drive, S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30315

Hill, Ellis Don
Rural Education Improvement
Project
Tennessee Technological University
Cookeville, Tennessee 38501

Hinson, James H., Jr.
Southeastern Education Laboratory
Atlanta Component
1680 Tullie Circle, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30329

Hoffman, Father William
Catholic Schools of the
Atlanta Archdiocese
928 Gordon Street, S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30310

Holmes, E. A.
Emory University
Atlanta, Georgia 30322

Howard, James Lee
Atlanta Public Schools, Title I.
2930 Forrest Hills Drive, S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30315

Jackson, William
Atlanta University School
of Social Work
1660 Drew Drive, N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30318

Johnston, Thesba N.
Atlanta University
223 Chestnut Street, S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

Jordan, Emily A.
Atlanta Area Teacher
Education Service
115 Thomson Hall
Emory University
Atlanta, Georgia 30322

Kelly, James, Jr.
National Institute for Advanced
Study in Teaching Disadvantaged
Youth
1126 Sixteenth Street
Washington, D. C. 20036

Ladd, Edward T.
Division of Teacher Education
Emory University
Atlanta, Georgia 30322

Lawrence, Richard E.
National Institute for
Advanced Study in Teaching
Disadvantaged Youth
1126 Sixteenth Street
Washington, D. C. 20036

Layton, George L.
Southeastern Education Laboratory
Tuscaloosa Component
Tuscaloosa, Alabama 35401

Lee, Carson
Clark College
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

Lee, Emmett L.
Clayton County Schools
Jonesboro, Georgia 30236

Lester, Charles T.
Emory University
Atlanta, Georgia 30322

McConnell, Gaither
Education Improvement Project
Tulane University
6823 St. Charles Avenue
New Orleans, Louisiana 70118

McDaniel, Clyde O., Jr.
Urban Laboratory in Education
Education Improvement Project
2930 Forrest Hills Drive, S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30315

McGeoch, Dorothy M.
Teachers College
Columbia University
525 W. 120th
New York, New York 10027

McKelpin, Joseph P.
Education Improvement Project
North Carolina College
2010 Campus Drive
Durham, North Carolina 27706

McKinney, Lorella
Oglethorpe College
4484 Peachtree Road, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30319

Madden, Father Thomas J.
Project Opportunity
Spring Hill College
Mobile, Alabama 36608

Mahar, Robert
Emory University
Atlanta, Georgia 30322

Malachy, Sister Mary
Catholic Schools of the
Atlanta Archdiocese
44 Hunter Street, S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Maloy, William
Rural Education Improvement Project
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306

Martin, Edmund C.
Georgia Educational
Improvement Council
100 Edgewood Avenue, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Martin, John
Atlanta Public Schools
2930 Forrest Hills Drive, S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30315

Matheny, Kenneth B.
Georgia State College
33 Gilmer Street, S.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Moore, G. Alexander
Division of Teacher Education
Emory University
Atlanta, Georgia 30322

Mortenson, Paul
Division of Teacher Education
Emory University
Atlanta, Georgia 30322

Newkirk, Gwendolyn
Education Improvement Project
North Carolina College
Durham, North Carolina 27706

Newman, Rhoda S.
College of Education
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602

Nurss, Joanne R.
Division of Teacher Education
Emory University
Atlanta, Georgia 30322

O'Connor, Father Daniel O.
Catholic Schools of the
Atlanta Archdiocese
320 Courtland Street, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Osborne, William D.
Urban Laboratory in Education
Education Improvement Project
2930 Forrest Hills Drive, S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30315

Owens, Ted R.
State Department of Education
State Office Building
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Perkins, Mary Ellen
State Department of Education
State Office Building
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Perrodin, Alex F.
College of Education
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602

Renfroe, Carl G.
City Schools of Decatur
Decatur, Georgia 30030

Richards, Violet K.
Education Improvement Project
Dillard University
New Orleans, Louisiana 70122

Rogers, Luther R.
Southeastern Education
Laboratory
Gainesville Component
Gainesville, Florida 32601

Rosen, Bruce
Anti-Defamation League of
B'nai B'rith
41 Exchange Place
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Rudbeck, Virginia
National Institute for
Advanced Study in Teaching
Disadvantaged Youth
1126 16th Street
Washington, D. C. 20036

Samkange, Tommie
Project Opportunity
Tuskegee Institute
Tuskegee, Alabama 36088

Saunders, Deloris
Urban Laboratory in Education
Education Improvement Project
2930 Forrest Hills Drive, S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30315

Schab, Fred
College of Education
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602

Schmid, Ralph
Division of Teacher Education
Emory University
Atlanta, Georgia 30322

Schueler, Herbert
Richmond College
33 W. Forty-Second Street
New York, New York 10036

Sessions, Lucille
City Schools of Decatur
Decatur, Georgia 30030

Shufelt, Lynn F.
Atlanta Area Teacher Education
Service
Emory University ✓
Atlanta, Georgia 30322

Skypek, Dora Helen
Division of Teacher Education
Emory University
Atlanta, Georgia 30322

Smith, Hermon B.
Southern Education Foundation
811 Cypress Street, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

Sparks, Edithgene
Oglethorpe College
4484 Peachtree Road, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30319

Sprayberry, W. Paul
Southeastern Education Laboratory
Athens Component
Marietta, Georgia 30060

Stair, Mary
Urban Laboratory in Education
2930 Forrest Hills Drive, S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30315

Teague, Wayne
Southeastern Education Laboratory
Auburn Component
Auburn, Alabama 36830

Thompson, Nelle
Fulton County Schools
165 Central Avenue, S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Thornton, Cecil M.
Atlanta Public Schools, Area IV
2531 Gordon Road, S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30311

Threatte, Bernard
Atlanta Public Schools, Area III
2380 Peachtree Road, N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30305

Todd, J. Paul
Atlanta Public Schools, Area II
711 Catherine Street, S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30310

Toothman, Rex
Southeastern Education Laboratory
Tallahassee Component
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Ullrich, LeRoy W.
Project Opportunity
Centre College
Danville, Kentucky 40422

Vergason, Glenn
Georgia State College
33 Gilmer Street, S.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Wawrzyniak, Alex
State Department of Education
State Office Building
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Weaver, Edward K.
Atlanta University
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

West, Clara
Georgia Education Association
(TEPS)
Fort Valley College
Fort Valley, Georgia 31030

Wilkerson, Doxey
Yeshiva University
55 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10010

Williams, Sharon
Urban Laboratory in Education
2930 Forrest Hills Drive, S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30315

Wilson, Maudecca
Project Opportunity
Albany State College
Albany, Georgia 31701

Wilson, Prince
Atlanta University
Center Corporation
Atlanta University
Atlanta, Georgia 30314